



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2022

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORCROSS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 16, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONALD NORCROSS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, bless us with Your abundance this day. All that we seek may we receive. Then may we see that You alone have provided for us.

We dedicate the work of our hands and our minds to Your purpose. Allow us all that we need, for in You we have the plenitude of Your abundant grace.

When we are uncertain that we have enough time, energy, or information to carry out our responsibilities to our country, our communities, or our families, remind us that You are able to bless us beyond our limited human vision, and provide for us when we fall short.

Remind us also that more than just the work that we do or the daily lives that we lead, You offer to us the wealth of spiritual prosperity available in You. May we draw from Your spirit the resources we need to face the profound challenges and meet the profane contests that seek to undermine our integrity and rob us of hope.

In all things, O God, may we call upon You and the mercy You desire to lavish upon us. In this may we find life and have it more abundantly.

In Your generous name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LUCAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL MICHAEL PAREDES AND OFFICER JOSEPH SANTANA

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two El Monte police officers, Corporal Michael Paredes and Officer Joseph Santana, killed in the line of duty on Tuesday night. The two officers were fatally injured while investigating a domestic violence call.

Corporal Paredes started his career with the El Monte Police Department as a full-time officer in July 2000. Prior to being appointed corporal, he worked

on specialized assignments. Corporal Paredes is survived by his wife, daughter, and son.

Officer Santana began his law enforcement career with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department as a deputy sheriff. After 3 years, he accepted a position as a police officer in the city of El Monte, allowing Santana to serve his hometown. He is survived by his wife, daughter, and twin boys.

Our hearts are filled with deep sadness today as we mourn the loss of these brave officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice while protecting our community. Their dedication will never be forgotten.

Our heartfelt prayers and condolences go out to the officers' families and all of the friends and loved ones in the El Monte community.

ROLL BACK REGULATIONS TO PREVENT FAMINE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Russian invasion of Ukraine, world leaders have been warning of imminent food shortages, including our own President.

Two of the largest producers of wheat and oilseed are embroiled at war. Ukrainian civilians are fighting to protect their homes and their self-sovereignty. They aren't out planting crops as normal.

Meanwhile, there are breaking reports of Russian soldiers stealing Ukrainian wheat, selling it at marked-up costs to nations facing food insecurity in Africa.

Meanwhile, the Russian Navy has blocked grain carriers from leaving Ukraine's Black Sea port of Odessa in an effort to blackmail the world into supporting Putin's war.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5613

The U.N. is trying to broker a deal that will enable Ukraine's grain to be shipped from ports such as Odessa, but Russia has said it wants Western sanctions lifted as part of the deal. Twenty million tons of Ukrainian grain is stuck in Ukraine, at risk of being stolen by Russians.

What are we doing in this country? We are not producing the way we could in California. Waters are being shifted away from farmers, and so our own wheat crops in northern California are dying out.

The Biden administration must roll back the regulations that are making it hard for farmers in this country to do what they need to do to be a part of this world solution for food, as famine will soon be upon us, especially in the 2023 crop year.

TRAGEDY IN POTTSTOWN

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 26, an explosion erupted in the tight-knit community of Pottstown, Pennsylvania, destroying two homes and, tragically, killing five people, a grandmother and four of her grandchildren, and also seriously injuring their parents.

Today, I want to remember Francine White, 67, and her grandchildren, Alana Wood, 13, Jeremiah White, 12, Nehe-miah White, 10, Tristan White, 8.

It is hard to paint a picture with words of the devastation of a home, the people who lived there and dreamed in it, reduced to rubble, a family gone, suddenly.

Now, there is a deep hole in Hale Street, and a huge hole is left in the hearts of their neighbors. They have made a vigil on their block and spent countless hours trying to make sense of the tragedy.

Pottstown, I know you have always been a strong community. You are Pottstown Strong. Know that I will be with you, with your neighbors, as we figure out how this happened to be sure it never happens again.

My prayers are with the family and the entire community of Pottstown. May their memories be a blessing.

AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE PAYING FOR PRESIDENT'S MISTAKES

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the biggest challenge facing Missouri families right now is sky-high inflation. They know that President Biden and Washington Democrats have only themselves to blame for driving inflation to the highest level in 40 years.

Last month alone, inflation cost Missouri families an extra \$663. That is about the same as a monthly payment on a brand-new pickup truck.

Gas prices are the highest they have been, at over \$5 a gallon. The cost to fill up an F-150 is over \$150.

Families are paying more to put food on their tables, clothes on their backs, and gasoline in their cars. Milk is up 15 percent. Bread is up 14 percent. Bacon is up 18 percent.

Just yesterday, the Federal Reserve raised interest rates for the third time since March. This is yet another price increase for families, farmers, and small businesses.

The American people cannot afford to keep paying for President Biden's mistakes.

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY DREAMERS

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 10-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, more commonly known as DACA.

Ten years ago, President Obama and Democrats reaffirmed America's tradition as the land of opportunity by creating DACA. Since that day, brave young immigrants, known as Dreamers, have provided massive contributions on their path to the American Dream.

DACA gave Dreamers a chance to do that, to dream big. It allowed them to use their talents, giving them a chance to seek higher education, work, and, most importantly, protection from deportation. They were there for us on the front lines, working as healthcare workers, all kinds of workers, to help us through the pandemic, and we thank them.

While we celebrate DACA as a significant temporary achievement for all of America, it is by no means a substitute for fixing our broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I promise to continue our fight for comprehensive immigration reform so that we can finally keep families together permanently.

CELEBRATING DREAMERS ON DACA'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to call for immediate action to protect our Nation's Dreamers.

Yesterday, we marked the 10th anniversary of the DACA program with a relentless focus on our goal to provide a pathway to citizenship for our Nation's Dreamers.

Over the last 5 years, we have seen persistent attacks on DACA, and the need to act could not be more urgent.

You see, DACA has been a rocket booster for our economy. In my district

alone, Dreamers contribute nearly \$300 million in GDP. They are doctors, lawyers, essential workers, engineers, businessowners, and job creators. They make America stronger, and they shouldn't have to live in fear of deportation.

I call on 10 Republican Senators to do what is right: Support the House-passed bipartisan Dream and Promise Act, pass it in the Senate, and bring humanity back to our immigration system and restore American values.

To all the Dreamers who are watching, know that I celebrate you. I stand with you, and fight for you.

Estan en casa. You are home. Home is here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month. During the month of June, we raise awareness for those suffering from post-traumatic stress disorders.

After a trauma or life-threatening event, it is common to have reactions such as upsetting memories, increased jumpiness, or trouble sleeping. If these reactions do not go away, or if they get worse, you might suffer from PTSD.

PTSD is especially prevalent for those who have served in the military, affecting nearly 30 percent of Vietnam veterans and up to 20 percent of veterans who served during the global war on terror.

As a former rehabilitation specialist, I know firsthand the incredible strides individuals can make when they have access to appropriate rehabilitation.

PTSD Awareness Month is not only an opportunity to raise awareness about PTSD; it is also an opportunity to raise awareness about treatment options.

I applaud all the organizations that raise awareness about this important issue during June. There is help and support for those who have PTSD.

COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL OF JAMES JOYCE'S "ULYSSES"

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the centennial of James Joyce's "Ulysses," arguably one of the great literary accomplishments in history. The time-honored epic was published in its entirety on Joyce's 40th birthday, February 2, 1922.

Born in Dublin and educated at University College Dublin, his words transcend countries across the world. The

story is read and studied worldwide, and Joyce himself has become an intrinsic part of world culture.

Through a stream of consciousness writing style, and with humor and parody, Joyce has kept literary thinkers and historians engaged with interpreting his words, even 100 years later.

In 265,222 words, Joyce chronicles the simple and even mundane encounters of protagonist Leopold Bloom on one ordinary day in Dublin: Thursday, June 16, 1904. Yet, Joyce does it with such wit, linguistic exuberance, and high regard for the ordinary and often overlooked details that readers remain captivated.

I am one of those readers.

June 16, today, is considered by Joyce fans as Bloomsday, and festivals are taking place in Dublin, here in the States, and around the world.

As such, let me wish all of you a happy Bloomsday.

□ 0915

MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1170, I call up the bill (H.R. 7606) to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-50, modified by the amendment printed in part E of House Report 117-366, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

TITLE I—MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR

Sec. 101. Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. Additional nutrient management assistance.

TITLE III—AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE

Sec. 301. Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force.

TITLE IV—BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION

Sec. 401. Biofuel infrastructure and agriculture product market expansion.

TITLE V—YEAR-ROUND FUEL CHOICE

Sec. 501. Ethanol waiver.

TITLE VI—PRODUCING RESPONSIBLE ENERGY AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES AND SOLUTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (PRECISE)

Sec. 601. Conservation loan and loan guarantee program.

Sec. 602. Assistance to rural entities.

Sec. 603. Environmental Quality Incentives Program.

Sec. 604. Conservation Stewardship Program.

Sec. 605. Delivery of technical assistance.

TITLE VII—BUTCHER BLOCK ACT

Sec. 701. Assistance for new and expanded livestock or poultry processors.

Sec. 702. New and expanding livestock or poultry processing grants.

TITLE VIII—LOWER FOOD AND FUEL COSTS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR

SEC. 101. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 216 (7 U.S.C. 6916) the following:

“SEC. 217. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Department an office, to be known as the ‘Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Office’).

“(b) **SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.**—The Office shall be headed by the Special Investigator for Competition Matters (referred to in this section as the ‘Special Investigator’), who shall be a senior career employee appointed by the Secretary.

“(c) **DUTIES.**—The Special Investigator shall—

“(1) use all available tools, including subpoenas, to investigate and prosecute violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) by packers and live poultry dealers with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agricultural sector;

“(2) serve as a Department liaison to, and act in consultation with, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agricultural sector;

“(3) act in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security with respect to national security and critical infrastructure security in the food and agricultural sector;

“(4) maintain a staff of attorneys and other professionals with appropriate expertise; and

“(5) in carrying out the requirements of this subsection, coordinate with the Office of the General Counsel and the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

“(d) **PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding title 28, United States Code, the Special Investigator shall have the authority to bring any civil or administrative action authorized under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) against a packer.

“(2) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section alters the authority of the Secretary to issue a subpoena pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

“(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—With respect to any of the actions brought under this subsection in Federal district court, the Special Investigator shall notify the Attorney General.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) The authority of the Secretary to carry out section 217.”.

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by redesignating the first section 225 (relating to Food Access Liaison) (7 U.S.C. 6925) as section 224A.

TITLE II—CROP NUTRIENT USE AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE PRACTICE ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. CROP NUTRIENT USE AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE PRACTICE ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) **PAYMENTS.**—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2023, the Secretary shall make payments under this section to producers—

(1) to assist in reducing the costs associated with the utilization of crop nutrients; or

(2) to adopt precision agriculture practices to address the utilization of crop nutrients or water availability.

(b) **AMOUNT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A payment to a producer under this section shall not exceed 100 percent of the costs of the activity for which the assistance is provided.

(2) **COST SHARE.**—If the Secretary determines that a producer is receiving other Federal funds for the activity for which the assistance is provided, a payment to the producer under this section shall be in an amount that does not, in combination with such other funds, exceed 100 percent of the costs of such activity.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

SEC. 202. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed as a conservation or environmental program within the meaning of section 5(g) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c(g)).

TITLE III—AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE

SEC. 301. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 229. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish within the

Department of Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force (in this section referred to as the ‘Task Force’).

“(b) MISSION.—The mission of the Task Force shall be to—

“(1) help to promote the leadership of the United States with respect to the stability of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(2) encourage a government-wide approach through partnerships and collaboration with the private sector, labor organizations, the governments of countries that are allies or key international partners of the United States, States or political subdivisions thereof, and Tribal governments in order to—

“(A) promote the resilience of the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(B) identify, prepare for, and respond to shocks to the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(3) monitor the resilience, diversity, security, and strength of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(4) support the availability of agriculture and food system supply chain goods for domestic manufacturers, domestic producers, and domestic enterprises in the United States and in countries that are allies or key international partners;

“(5) assist the Federal Government in preparing for and responding to shocks to the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(6) support the creation of jobs with competitive wages in the United States agriculture and food system sector; and

“(7) coordinate executive branch actions necessary to carry out the functions described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

“(c) SPECIAL ADVISOR ON SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE.—The head of the Task Force shall be the Special Advisor on Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response (in this section, referred to as the ‘Special Advisor’) who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(d) AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

“(1) EVALUATION.—The Special Advisor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation, shall conduct an evaluation of the stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain. The evaluation shall focus on the items listed in subsection (b).

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Special Advisor shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a) that includes the following:

“(A) An evaluation of—

“(i) the strengths of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(ii) the weaknesses of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(iii) current and potential future critical bottlenecks in the agriculture and food system supply chain, including transportation bottlenecks in the distribution of agricultural inputs, processed and unprocessed food and food input products, and consumer-ready food products;

“(iv) workforce challenges and opportunities in the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(v) the overall stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(B) A discussion of existing Federal legal barriers, if any, that negatively impact the stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(C) Specific recommendations to improve the security, safety, and resilience of the agri-

culture and food system supply chain, including recommendations that address challenges identified under paragraph (1) and that also address—

“(i) long-term strategies;

“(ii) industry best practices;

“(iii) risk-mitigation actions to prevent future bottlenecks and vulnerabilities at all levels of the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(iv) legislative and regulatory actions that would positively impact the security and resilience of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(e) TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall terminate on the earlier of—

“(1) the date on which the report required by subsection (d) is submitted; or

“(2) September 30, 2023.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)), as amended by section 101, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) The authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force in accordance with section 229.”

TITLE IV—BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION

SEC. 401. BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, to remain available until expended, to carry out this section.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use the amounts made available pursuant to subsection (a) to provide grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities described in subsection (c)—

(1) to install, retrofit, or otherwise upgrade fuel dispensers or pumps and related equipment, storage tank system components, and other infrastructure required at a location to ensure the environmentally safe availability of fuel containing ethanol blends at levels greater than 10 percent (as determined by the Secretary) or fuel containing biodiesel blends at levels greater than 5 percent (as determined by the Secretary); and

(2) to build and retrofit distribution systems for ethanol blends, traditional and pipeline biodiesel terminal operations (including rail lines), and home heating oil distribution centers or equivalent entities—

(A) to blend biodiesel; and

(B) to carry ethanol and biodiesel.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Entities eligible to receive a grant under this section are transportation fueling facilities and distribution facilities, including fueling stations, convenience stores, supermarket retailer fueling stations, fleet facilities, as well as fuel terminal operations, midstream partners, and heating oil distribution facilities or equivalent entities.

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of carrying out a project for which a grant is provided under this section shall be not more than 75 percent.

(e) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not limit the amount of funding an eligible entity may receive under this section, except that such funding is subject to the availability of appropriations.

TITLE V—YEAR-ROUND FUEL CHOICE

SEC. 501. ETHANOL WAIVER.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(4)—

(A) by striking “(4) The Administrator, upon” and inserting the following:

“(4) WAIVER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, on”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) REID VAPOR PRESSURE.—A fuel or fuel additive that has been granted a waiver under subparagraph (A) prior to January 1, 2017, and meets all the conditions of that waiver other than any limitations of the waiver with respect to Reid Vapor Pressure, may be introduced into commerce if the fuel or fuel additive meets all other applicable Reid Vapor Pressure requirements.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or more” after “10 percent”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “additional alcohol or”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(A), by inserting “or more” after “10 percent”.

TITLE VI—PRODUCING RESPONSIBLE ENERGY AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES AND SOLUTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (PRECISE)

SEC. 601. CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) the adoption of precision agriculture practices, and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology;”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) producers who use the loans to adopt precision agriculture practices or acquire precision agriculture technology, including adoption or acquisition for the purpose of participating in the environmental quality incentives program under subchapter A of chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) 90 percent of the principal amount of the loan in the case of—

“(A) a producer that is a qualified socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher or a beginning farmer or rancher; or

“(B) loans that are used for the purchase of precision agriculture technology.”; and

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COORDINATION WITH NRCS.—In making or guaranteeing loans under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that there is coordination between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.”.

SEC. 602. ASSISTANCE TO RURAL ENTITIES.

Section 310B(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) expanding precision agriculture practices, including by financing equipment and farm-wide broadband connectivity, in order to promote best-practices, reduce costs, and improve the environment.”.

SEC. 603. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1240A(6)(B)(v) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa—

1(6)(B)(v)) is amended by inserting “(including the adoption of precision agriculture practices and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology)” after “planning”.

(b) PAYMENTS.—

(1) OTHER PAYMENTS.—Section 1240B(d)(6) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)(6)) is amended—

(A) by striking “A producer shall” and inserting the following:

“(A) PAYMENTS UNDER THIS SUBTITLE.—A producer shall”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A producer receiving payments for practices on eligible land under the program may also receive a loan or loan guarantee under section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to cover costs for the same practices on the same land.

“(ii) NOTICE TO PRODUCER.—The Secretary shall inform a producer participating in the program in writing of the availability of a loan or loan guarantee under section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act as it relates to costs of implementing practices under this program.”.

(2) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR HIGH-PRIORITY PRACTICES.—Section 1240B(d)(7) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)(7)) is amended, in the subsection heading, by inserting “STATE-DETERMINED” before “HIGH-PRIORITY”.

(3) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PRECISION AGRICULTURE.—Section 1240B(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PRECISION AGRICULTURE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary may increase the amount that would otherwise be provided for a practice under this subsection to not more than 90 percent of the costs associated with adopting precision agriculture practices and acquiring precision agriculture technology.”.

(c) CONSERVATION INCENTIVE CONTRACTS.—Section 1240B(j)(2)(A)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(j)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “(which may include the adoption of precision agriculture practices and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology)” after “incentive practices”.

SEC. 604. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS FOR RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATIONS AND ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—Section 1240L(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-24(d)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT” and inserting “, ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT, AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) precision agriculture.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “or advanced grazing management” and inserting “, advanced grazing management, or precision agriculture”.

SEC. 605. DELIVERY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 1242(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SOIL HEALTH PLANNING.—The Secretary shall emphasize the use of third-party providers in providing technical assistance for soil health planning, including planning related to the use of cover crops, precision conservation management, comprehensive nutrient management planning, and other innovative plans.”.

TITLE VII—BUTCHER BLOCK ACT

SEC. 701. ASSISTANCE FOR NEW AND EXPANDED LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY PROCESSORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make or guarantee a loan for the purpose of—

(1) increasing capacity of livestock and poultry processing, facilitating economic opportunity for livestock and poultry producers through processing activities, and diversifying processing ownership;

(2) increasing the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers through investment in processing capacity;

(3) improving, developing, or financing livestock and poultry processing capacity or employment including through the financing of working capital; or

(4) promoting the interstate trade and local sales of processed livestock and poultry by financing improvements to meet relevant Federal, State, and local regulatory standards.

(b) ELIGIBILITY; GENERAL LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—An entity shall be eligible for a loan or guarantee under this section if the entity is—

(A) a public, private, or cooperative organization organized on a for-profit or nonprofit basis;

(B) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation, or any other federally recognized Indian tribal group; or

(C) an individual.

(2) FACILITY LOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a facility constructed, expanded, modified, refurbished, or re-equipped with proceeds from a loan made or guaranteed under this section shall be in a rural area.

(B) EXCEPTION.—A facility constructed, expanded, modified, refurbished, or re-equipped with proceeds from a loan made or guaranteed under this section may be in a non-rural area if—

(i) the primary use of the loan involved is for the facility, and the facility will increase the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers that are located within 300 miles of the facility;

(ii) the loan involved will be used to increase the capacity in livestock and poultry processing in a region; and

(iii) the principal amount of the loan involved does not exceed \$50,000,000.

(C) RURAL AREA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “rural area” has the meaning given the term in section 343(a)(13) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(13)).

(3) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF LOAN INVOLVED.—A loan of more than \$50,000,000 may not be made or guaranteed under this section.

(B) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY.—A loan may not be made or guaranteed under this section to an entity that is owned in partnership or in whole by—

(i) a foreign entity; or

(ii) an entity that currently processes over 5 percent of the daily harvest of any species.

(c) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE WITH RESPECT TO COOPERATIVES.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF LOAN INVOLVED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(3), a loan of not more than \$100,000,000 may be made or guaranteed for a cooperative organization under this section.

(B) CONDITIONS APPLICABLE IF LOAN INVOLVED IS FOR MORE THAN \$50,000,000.—A loan of more than \$50,000,000 may not be made or guaranteed for a cooperative organization under this section unless the loan is used to carry out a project that significantly increases the livestock and poultry processing in a region, where insufficient processing capacity exists, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) INTANGIBLE ASSETS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether a cooperative organization is eligible for a loan or guarantee under this section, the Secretary may consider the market value of a properly appraised brand name, patent, or trademark of the cooperative.

(B) ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.—In the sole discretion of the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the action would not create or otherwise contribute to an unreasonable risk of default or loss to the Federal Government, the Secretary may take accounts receivable as security for the obligations entered into in connection with a loan made or guaranteed under this section, and a borrower may use accounts receivable as collateral to secure such a loan.

(3) PURCHASE OF COOPERATIVE STOCK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make or guarantee a loan in accordance with this section to an individual farmer or rancher for the purpose of purchasing capital stock of a farmer or rancher cooperative undertaking an eligible project under this section.

(B) PROCESSING CONTRACTS DURING INITIAL PERIOD.—A cooperative described in subparagraph (A) with respect to which a farmer or rancher receives a guarantee to purchase stock under subparagraph (A) may contract for services to fulfill any eligible purpose under this section, during the 5-year period beginning on the date the cooperative commences operations, in order to provide adequate time for the planning and construction of the processing facility of the cooperative.

(C) FINANCIAL INFORMATION.—A farmer or rancher from whom the Secretary requires financial information as a condition of making or guaranteeing a loan under subparagraph (A) shall provide the information in the manner generally required by commercial agricultural lenders in the geographical area in which the farmer or rancher is located.

(d) CONDITIONS APPLICABLE WITH RESPECT TO USING LOAN INVOLVED FOR REFINANCING.—A borrower may use 25 percent of a loan made or guaranteed under this section to refinance a loan made for a purpose described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the borrower is current and performing with respect to the loan to be refinanced;

(2) the borrower has not defaulted on any payment required to be made with respect to the loan to be refinanced;

(3) none of the collateral for the loan to be refinanced has been converted; and

(4) there is adequate security or full collateral for the loan to be refinanced.

(e) LOAN APPRAISAL.—The Secretary may require that any appraisal made in connection with a loan made or guaranteed under this section be conducted by a specialized appraiser that uses standards that are similar to standards used for similar purposes in the private sector, as determined by the Secretary.

(f) PREFERENCE.—In making or guaranteeing a loan under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to applicants that have experience in livestock and poultry processing and can quickly scale-up to increase overall processing capacity in the region involved.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

SEC. 702. NEW AND EXPANDING LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY PROCESSING GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to—

(1) expand, diversify, and increase capacity in livestock or poultry processing activities;

(2) improve compliance with livestock and poultry processing statutes (including the regulations issued thereunder), such as the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 661) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 454);

(3) identify and reduce barriers to entry for new livestock and poultry processors; or

(4) update, expand, or otherwise improve existing facilities.

(b) **ELIGIBLE GRANTEES.**—An entity shall be eligible for a grant under this section if the entity is—

(1) a governmental entity;

(2) a public, private, or cooperative organization organized on a for-profit or nonprofit basis; or

(3) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation or any other federally recognized Indian tribal group.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity to which a grant is made under this section may use the grant funds to establish or support new or expanded livestock or poultry processing activity, or other activity which will increase the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers, by undertaking a project, that—

(1) identifies and analyzes business opportunities, including feasibility studies as required for creditworthiness;

(2) identifies, trains, and provides technical assistance to existing or prospective rural entrepreneurs and managers or processing facilities;

(3) provides technical assistance to gain compliance with Federal, State, or local regulations;

(4) conducts regional, community, and local economic development planning and coordination, and leadership development; or

(5) establishes a center for training, technology, and trade that will provide training to livestock or poultry processing employees.

(d) **PREFERENCE.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to applicants that have experience in livestock and poultry processing and can quickly scale-up to increase overall processing capacity in the region involved.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

TITLE VIII—LOWER FOOD AND FUEL COSTS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Office of the Secretary”, \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out title IV Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act: Provided, That the Secretary may use up to 5 percent of amounts made available under this heading in this title for administrative costs, including salaries and expenses, research, data collection, and other associated costs, for carrying out such title IV: Provided further, That amounts made available for administrative costs pursuant to the preceding proviso may be transferred to “Rural Development Programs—Rural Development—Salaries and Expenses” for the purposes specified in such proviso.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 801. In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out title II, of which up to 5 percent may be used by the Secretary to provide technical assistance under such title II of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

SEC. 802. Each amount appropriated or made available by this title is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 803. Unless otherwise provided for by this title, the additional amounts appropriated by this title to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 804. Each amount provided by this title is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 805. (a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) **CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this title shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

This title may be cited as the “Lower Food and Fuel Costs Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support this package that is comprised of multiple bills that our House Agriculture Committee has advanced in a strong, bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the last 2 years have led to drastic fluctuations in prices. Whether you look at the ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic or the global disruptions associated with Putin’s war in Ukraine, American farmers, American ranchers, and consumers are, right now, facing terrible, increasing costs on the farm, at the grocery store, and at the gas station.

Our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act tackles these price increases head on by increasing competition, options at the pump, and by providing needed support for America’s agriculture sector at every stop of our food supply chain.

Mr. Speaker, our package includes four main pillars.

One: Ensuring robust competition in the meat and poultry sector.

Two: Lowering costs at the grocery store by lowering costs for our farmers and ranchers.

Three: By empowering our farmers to help provide fuel choices and lower prices at our gas stations.

Four: Strengthening the food supply chain.

Going further into each of these pillars, first, this package will establish an Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters in the Agriculture Secretary’s office.

When we held a hearing, Mr. Speaker, it was a very powerful hearing. It was the largest viewing audience for a hearing in the history of our Agriculture Committee.

We heard overwhelming evidence that continuing the status quo when it comes to enforcement will not provide more desperately needed competition and fairness within our meat and poultry industries.

So we believe earnestly that the USDA and their expertise in agriculture issues gives them a strong footing to investigate the competitiveness in our meat and poultry sectors and to enforce existing laws to ensure a fair playing field for our family farmers, ranchers, and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we were informed at that hearing that right now, we are losing 17,000 ranching farms every year. This has to stop.

Our bill also includes a bipartisan provision that will support the creation and expansion of processing capacity for small- and medium-sized producers to help alleviate this terrible, threatening consolidation just to a handful of four meatpacking companies. This is the core of this legislation.

Our second pillar addresses a key piece in the puzzle of rising prices. At the grocery store, there have been record increases in input costs for agricultural producers, with fertilizer prices for both specialty and row crop producers skyrocketing. This bill will help reduce their input costs so planning decisions are not impacted.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of fertilizer costs, it is very important for the Nation to know that right now, Russia produces and controls 66 percent of the fertilizer in the world. This needs to have serious, serious attention.

Our second pillar of this legislative package is the puzzle of rising prices.

Our third pillar addresses fuel costs, which is something that impacts everyone, whether you are paying more at the gas pump or seeing increasing prices in the grocery store from higher trucking and transportation costs.

This package addresses these concerns in a way that empowers our farmers and provides more choice and lower prices for our consumers at the gas pump and at the grocery store.

Mr. Speaker, our biofuels adoption and investment helps reduce our reliance on foreign oil and the supply shocks facing our gasoline supply, while also bolstering a revenue stream

for our farmers and producers across the country.

Bolstering our use of ethanol from E10 to E15 will not impact the environment, our Environmental Protection Agency confirms this, nor will it slow down the rollout of electric vehicles.

This vital package of bills makes much-needed improvements in our supply chain. A series of shocks to our beef supply chain, combined with a concentrated processing infrastructure, resulted in high prices for meat at our grocery stores and lower prices for our producers, farmers, and ranchers.

Specifically, one provision calls for the formation of an Agricultural and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force to examine our food supply chain and report back to us here in Congress on the strengths and the weaknesses that exist.

I am extremely proud of the work of our House Agriculture Committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, who have worked tirelessly to put this strong bipartisan bill together.

We have garnered for this bill extremely important bipartisan participation. This is what our Nation is hungry for; Democrats and Republicans working together to bring down these high costs for our food and our fuel. This bill is a bill that our American people want and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I note that several of the sections in this bill codify or are complementary to ongoing and planned programs that the Department of Agriculture is carrying out or planning to carry out with existing authorities and funding. The intent behind passage of this bill is to be additive to those efforts and is in no way intended to limit or pause those programs and efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7606 because, simply put, this bill does nothing in the immediate future to lower food and fuel costs.

Long before Russia's invasion of Ukraine, America's farm families and consumers were struggling with fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, each of which continue to contribute to increased food prices and diminished inventories.

Despite these crises, Democrats have neglected to take serious action to incentivize increased American production. In fact, we are here today to debate a bill that compounds the situation, further limiting American farmers' abilities to meet global food demand and doubling down on the idea that more spending and big government will feed the world.

Adding insult to injury, the White House has been quick to blame the private sector and alleged industry concentration for the current crisis.

Economists across the spectrum—including former Obama and Clinton administration officials—have dismissed

the strategy as misleading, at best, or otherwise, blatantly political.

So it is not surprising that at the behest of the White House, we are debating a package where the anchor piece of legislation perpetuates a tired narrative of blame, duplicates existing authorities, ignores industry and producers, and undermines the Department of Justice.

It is also not surprising the party of defund the police also has become the party of more cops for cows. At every turn, this administration has obsessively pointed the finger at the packing industry, in particular, blaming them almost singlehandedly for rising food costs.

They have done so via blog posts, contrived public events, and press briefings, all without any acknowledgment of the culpability of their own reckless spending and heavy-handed regulatory agenda.

My Democratic colleagues have dutifully played along, executing sensationalized hearings and political theatrics designed to support unvetted and controversial bills.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder many of us question the seriousness of the bill before us today. If this were a serious exercise, my Democratic colleagues would not have paired such an egregious example of legislative overreach with several other very thoughtful, very bipartisan bills.

If this were a serious exercise, my Democrat colleagues would not have added two unvetted Democrat amendments that are more about political point-scoring than genuine near-term policy solutions.

If this were a serious exercise, my Democrat colleagues would have worked with Republicans to form a concrete, immediate policy solution with a chance of consideration in the Senate.

Now, I know both parties understand the gravity of these issues. While we may have disagreements on policy, I was confident that we could find common-ground solutions, if given the opportunity.

□ 0930

I am dumbfounded as to why Democratic leadership would choose this moment—when consumers are deciding between gas in their cars or food on their tables—as an attempt to score political points, especially on the heels of a nearly 9 percent increase in consumer prices, the worst this Nation has seen since the Carter administration.

So, Republicans forged ahead, and we developed solutions. Earlier this week, Leader MCCARTHY and I, along with nearly 100 of our Republican colleagues, sent a letter to President Biden outlining administrative actions that he could take immediately to mitigate rising input costs, and strengthen the role that American agriculture plays in global food stability.

And yesterday, I, along with many of those same Members, introduced H.R.

8069, the Reducing Farm Input Costs and Barriers to Domestic Production Act. This bill would reverse many of the more harmful regulatory burdens spearheaded by this administration, address escalating input costs, and provide certainty to farmers, ranchers, agribusinesses, and other entities across the food and agriculture supply chain.

Specifically, the bill provides relief from EPA's unprecedented actions related to pesticides and other vital crop protection tools; offers clarity related to WOTUS regulations; rescinds the SEC's harmful proposed rule on climate-related disclosures; reinstates the 2020 NEPA streamlining; and requires an economic analysis on the costs and the benefits of GIPSA rules. These are all actions which would provide immediate relief to our farm families and households across the globe, and they all were rejected by the Rules Committee majority as amendments to the bill before us.

The letter and this bill stand in stark contrast to what we have seen from the White House and the Democrats in Congress and their efforts to scapegoat private industry for skyrocketing gas prices and sustained supply chain failures.

So, in short, the crises we are facing cannot and will not be mitigated with unfunded mandates, duplicative authorities, politicized agencies, and Big Government, all of which are laced into H.R. 7606.

I remain opposed to this bill and the process which got us here but stand willing to work with my colleagues on commonsense, near-term solutions to provide immediate relief to farmers, ranchers, foresters, and American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7606.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), my good friend.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this important bill, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

American families are struggling. They are continuing to see rising gas prices even as oil and gas companies are making record profits.

Higher prices at the grocery store are making it harder to put food on the table, and a lot of this is because farmers are struggling with increasing fuel prices. Costs and availability of transportation to both domestic and export markets continue to be a challenge for the wheat, cherry, apple, and pear growers in my district.

This is a global problem, but it is a problem that we can take steps to ease right here at home. This bill provides the resources to do just that.

It addresses the cost of fuel by allowing year-round sales of higher ethanol blends, which are consistently less expensive than higher octane gas.

It addresses high food prices by helping farmers and helping our supply chain.

Fertilizer costs are at record highs since most of our fertilizer is typically sourced from Russia. This bill helps farmers spend less on inputs without lowering crop yields.

We are paying skyrocketing prices for meat at the grocery store, but farmers and ranchers don't see any of that additional profit because four companies control 80 percent of U.S. meat processing. That is unfair.

This bill expands the availability and capacity of meat processing and will create new jobs, provide more options for small- and medium-sized ranching operations, and help lower the cost of meat at the grocery store.

Finally, addressing the cost of trucking and transportation will help farmers get their crops to market.

The whole goal here is to make life a little easier for the people we represent, to help you fill up your tank and feed your family. As the only member on the House Agriculture Committee from the Northwest, I will continue to do all that I can to support farmers and lower costs for American families.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the full House Agriculture Committee, who continues to this day to be an incredible advocate for agriculture and a mentor of mine as I have worked my way into this leadership role.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7606 because American farmers and ranchers deserve real assistance, real relief, real policy solutions.

To understand my opposition, you must understand the part of the country that I represent and was raised in. The Third District of Oklahoma was the epicenter of the drought, the Dust Bowl, and the economic depression of the 1930s. This was a time when horrible weather conditions collided with misguided Federal ag and misguided Federal monetary policy to create an environment that profoundly changed the region that my family has called home for over 120 years.

I was raised on these stories, and it was their experiences that shaped my view on what the role of the Federal Government should be. The Federal Government should be passing and enacting policies that help people and businesses, not hinder them. Unfortunately, the Biden administration and House Democrats seem to not hold that same view.

During the past 5 years, American farmers and ranchers have weathered

volatile world markets, devastating natural disasters, prolonged droughts, supply chain disruptions, ever-increasing input costs, and soaring inflation.

Yet, the only thing the Biden administration and House Democrats seem interested in doing is increasing regulatory burdens, limiting access to fuel, and passing spending packages that fuel inflation.

Mr. Speaker, if House Democrats were truly interested in providing relief for American farmers and ranchers, they would join my Republican colleagues and me in calling for the Biden administration to reinstate the Trump-era Waters of the United States rule and rescind the Biden administration's WOTUS rule.

If Democrats were interested in reducing the cost of farm inputs like fertilizer and fuel, they would work with us to restore and expand domestic energy production. They would join us in calling for the Biden administration to rescind the SEC's proposed rule on climate-related disclosure.

This rule is not only a ploy to divert capital away from traditional energy investments, it also requires farmers, regardless of size, to track and report environmental data to public companies with which they work.

Finally, House Democrats are touting this bill as a solution to the issue of consolidation in the meatpacking industry. As we all know, DOJ—yes, the Department of Justice—is in the middle of an ongoing investigation into the meatpacking industry, an investigation that was launched under the Trump administration.

I feel strongly that if there is collusion, manipulation, or other wrongdoing by packers, then the existing law should be enforced under the existing authorities at USDA and DOJ. There are civil and criminal penalties if violations are found. Changing those authorities or laws in the middle of an ongoing investigation only helps to confuse and complicate the eventual DOJ findings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this messaging bill and join with me in calling for real solutions for American farmers and ranchers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

Across the country, workers are calling out sick because of COVID, truck deliveries and other shipments are facing delays, and people are panic-buying, all leading to product shortages and soaring prices.

Yet, while we know the COVID-19 pandemic has undoubtedly challenged our Nation's supply chain, we also know there are systemic imbalances in our economy. Decreased competition, driven by market concentration, has allowed companies to further drive up costs and their profits at the expense of

hardworking Americans in one of our most vulnerable moments.

In the beef-processing market, for example, four dominant companies control 85 percent of the market. The four largest poultry processing companies made up more than half of the market in 2015, up from 35 percent of the market in 1986.

We have seen this trend all across our economy, as large corporations have squeezed out independent businesses, eliminating competition. As a result, hardworking Americans throughout this country are paying more as food prices skyrocket, particularly for meat.

Provisions included in the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act will help us tackle this very issue and help bring prices down across the board.

The Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act and the Butcher Block Act, for example, will help strengthen our investigatory and enforcement tools to address market competition issues while also investing in additional meat processing capacity.

The PRECISE Act will improve farming efficiency and help ensure farmers' resiliency to future disruptions in fertilizer supply.

The Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Investment and Market Expansion Act and the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act will help drive down prices at the pump for Americans and increase available fuel supply.

These are just a few of the provisions in this comprehensive package that will help ease the economic burden on American families and help create an economy that works for all of us.

I urge my colleagues to come together to help hardworking Americans by driving down these costs and supporting this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should see an extension, a little bigger of that poster that we saw there. That concentration occurred because of exactly what we are seeing today of government and Democrats leveling regulations. It was regulations that caused the concentration within the meatpacking industry. What happened when you put on more regulations, small- and medium-sized processors weren't able to continue to work. They couldn't cope with the compliance costs. They just couldn't handle those increased regulations.

Today, we are seeing not just additional regulations, but a whole new police officer being created under the poison pill within this legislation, special investigator bill.

I would argue that maybe we ought to blow that chart up a little more so we can see and project just how much more concentration occurs when we force more small- and medium-sized processors out of the business. It will result in increased concentration with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), a

great member of the Agriculture Committee who represents the Big First Congressional District.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 7606.

I support our country's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers because they are the lifeblood of America. They keep us food and fuel secure and therefore free and self-determining as a Nation.

I cosponsor the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act, which would address limitations on Reid vapor pressure and allow for producers to supply, and consumers to purchase, E15 year-round. I have supported this measure long before my time in Congress, and I will continue to be a strong proponent of year-round E15. A temporary waiver is not enough. We must make this decision permanent and provide certainty to producers. That bill is now part of H.R. 7606.

I cosponsor the Butcher Block Act, which would codify the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants and loans to expand meat and poultry processing capacity. I support consumer choice. That bill is now part of H.R. 7606.

In the House Agriculture Committee, I voted in favor of four other bills that are now part of H.R. 7606, but today's vote is disappointing because House Democrats ignored an effort made by Mr. DAVIS and others, one I am proud to cosponsor, to include an amendment separating these good pro-agriculture bills from a poison pill. Included in H.R. 7606 is a provision that would create a politically charged special investigator office at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to investigate and prosecute food producers in America.

You heard that right. The original H.R. 7606 and a provision in today's so-called Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act would create a new office at USDA to investigate and prosecute the people who work to feed us. I represent the Big First District of Kansas, which ranks number one in the country for the value of sales of cattle and calves at more than \$9 billion annually. We see the entire beef supply chain in the Big First, from cow-calf producers to cattle feeders and packers. Under the Packers and Stockyards Division at USDA, all of those players, all of them, are already subject to strict inspection. Under H.R. 7606, they would be subject to a type of politically charged scrutiny we expect of no other related business.

Do you think that a Democratic-controlled Congress and USDA would stop there? No. H.R. 7606 would set the horrible precedent for political administrations to inspect and prosecute anything and anyone they disagree with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today it is packing facilities, tomorrow it is corn-

fields and biofuel facilities, or wheat growers and milling stations. I support farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers in this country, and I am disappointed this poison pill is included.

□ 0945

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to clear up something that the gentleman just said. It is very important. The United States Department of Agriculture is the proper source to deal with this investigation. It needs to be investigated per the will of the American people, and there is no agency better equipped, better qualified, to find out what is going wrong.

According to the USDA, the language is clear on the special investigator being a career employee. It only specifies that the position be appointed by the Secretary and based on the qualifications of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country are justifiably frustrated by the higher prices they are experiencing at the pump, in the grocery store, and across the board.

Right now, working families in every district across this country are crying out for relief. They are tired of political games, and they are tired of partisan attacks. Our constituents don't want Congress in a food fight. They want compromise, and they want solutions.

My friends, today, we have a bipartisan, commonsense solution at our fingertips.

The Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act will lift up our constituents by lowering prices at the grocery store aisle and at the pump and creating a situation where we are seen as acting together.

My provision, the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act, will allow for the year-round sale of homegrown biofuels, which can sell for as much as 40 cents less per gallon than traditional gasoline. Why would we deny that low-cost alternative to working families who are so desperate for savings?

My Strengthening the Agriculture and Food Supply Chain Act will help lower prices at the grocery store by getting products from ships to shelves faster and shoring up our food supply chain for future generations. My friends, why would we deny these critical savings to our constituents who are simply trying to put food on the table?

The American people want action. They are calling for us to use every tool at our disposal to fight inflation and lower costs. We must respond to their call.

I appreciate the support of this package from my Democratic colleagues and many of my Republican colleagues, and I encourage all of you to vote "yes."

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During the recent packer hearing, Chairman SCOTT mentioned that he used a chart compiled of what really was cherry-picked data with zero context to accuse all four of the major beef packing CEOs of price-fixing and collusion.

The packing executives explained the multitudes of supply and demand dynamics supporting the data, including the cyclical ebbs and flows of cattle production. Each of them denied the chairman's accusation under oath.

Despite their denial, this week at the Rules Committee, the chairman accused the packers of lying under oath. According to the chairman, a price-fixing scheme is the only plausible explanation for increased meat prices. It is no wonder I have serious doubts about this administration's ability to objectively carry out these new authorities.

I agree with the chairman, who is a dear friend. We work well together on well over 99 percent of everything that we engage on, just not this particular poison pill today. USDA is the right place to be the cop on the beat for this. In fact, they already are.

USDA already has an entire Packers and Stockyards Division charged with enforcing the Packers and Stockyard Act that has been in place since the 1930s. Based on the latest available data, they have filed and closed almost 1,900 cases just in 2020 alone. The division already consists of a team of seasoned attorneys, market specialists, and auditors, and it has the option to pursue administrative enforcement through USDA's Office of General Counsel before an administrative law judge or through the Department of Justice in Federal court.

I agree the USDA is the place for oversight of the packing industry, and it is already in place. This duplicative mandate with all the issues it brings is not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the vice ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people need to understand two things. One, if you eat, you are involved in agriculture. And, two, food security is national security. So, we keep those things in mind as we have this conversation today. Everyone in this room is involved in agriculture.

Despite that, we have before us today a bill that makes it more difficult for our farmers and ranchers to carry out their primary mission, which is to feed, clothe, and shelter 98 percent of the population that is not engaged in agriculture. Two percent of Americans provide for 100 percent of Americans and the rest of the world. This bill doesn't truly address the challenges that they face every day.

Democrats would rather demonize producers in the private sector instead of taking responsibility for the inflation that is changing the lives of our

constituents every day everywhere in the country. Every day, our world becomes more globalized and our economies become more interconnected. As a result, the need for food security grows.

One day, Russia is weaponizing food in Ukraine, and the next day, China is buying pieces of the American agriculture supply chain.

I have said it before and will say it again: Agriculture security is national security, and we can no longer afford to stand by while our adversaries exploit the supply chain and American food security flounders under continued inflation inflicted by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 7606. For those of us who represent rural constituents, this should be the easiest “no” vote you ever make.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me clarify something the ranking member said. Yes, I was able to bring in all four CEOs of our meatpacking companies, and we were very grateful that they accepted our invitation. But our ranking member made a mistake. It wasn't all four that said in answer to my question about whether or not they agreed or had any agreement on pricing in our meat industry. Three said no; one said, “Not to my knowledge.”

Now, you must understand what we are dealing with here and why just that reply from them requires an investigation. That is what we are here for. That is why we did the hearing, to bring those parties in.

We must act, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, we cannot continue to lose 17,000 ranchers and farmers. Also, so many of them, thousands of them, have not made a profit in 5 years. We have a problem.

In a report, the GAO noted that the USDA's investigations were planned and conducted primarily by economists, without the formal involvement of attorneys from USDA's Office of General Counsel, or the OGC. As a result, a legal perspective that focused on assessing potential violations was generally absent when investigations were initiated and conducted. This is precisely why the special investigator bill is so important, because it alleviates an issue that has not had enough scrutiny and ensures that attorneys will be responsible for looking into possible violations.

The GAO also found that the USDA's Packers and Stockyards Act, PSA, investigations had not modernized to keep up with today's complex, competition-related concerns, with consolidation at the heart of this issue, nor had it implemented previous recommendations. It also recommended that GIPSA and USDA's Office of General Counsel work more closely together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAL-

LONE), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker from New Jersey, I thank Chairman SCOTT for the time and all he has been doing with his committee to put this excellent bill together.

Today, once again, in my opinion, the House is taking action to fight high gas prices and protect consumers by empowering farmers to provide homegrown fuel choices at the pump, an option that costs consumers 40 cents less per gallon.

At a time when Americans are paying record-high prices for gas, Big Oil continues to exploit market instability caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine to rake in record profits.

Big Oil companies collectively made \$41 billion in profits during the first quarter of this year. Some of these were record highs; others were the highest profits in over a decade.

It is abundantly clear that Big Oil companies are more interested in funneling billions in profits to their shareholders and executives than in addressing record-high gas prices for American consumers.

The House has to act, Mr. Speaker, to protect American families from this profiteering. That is why we are here today, to preserve and expand the availability of a cheaper and cleaner fuel option for the driving public.

The Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act combats fuel prices by allowing for the voluntary, year-round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, known as E15 or Unleaded 88. Blending more biofuels like ethanol into gasoline displaces demand for petroleum, helping to bring down gas prices for consumers.

Today, drivers are paying, on average, about 40 cents less per gallon to fill up their tanks with E15. This fuel provides significant savings for families during the summer driving season. Let's ensure it continues to be available at gas stations across the country.

Increasing the availability of E15 protects Americans from volatile global oil markets and eases the grip Big Oil has on American drivers.

By relying more on homegrown biofuels and less on fossil fuels, this legislation insulates American drivers from dramatic global price fluctuations, enhances our national security, creates local jobs, and bolsters true energy independence. It is a win-win across the board. It is one of the most powerful tools in our fight against global price shocks and oil and gas profiteering.

E15 is also a cleaner fuel option that emits less carbon pollution and burns cleaner than regular gasoline. Today's vote is also part of our broader effort to bring down prices while cutting climate pollution.

I thank Representatives CRAIG and AXNE for their leadership on preserving and expanding access to E15 across the country and Chairman SCOTT, once again, for including these critical E15 provisions in this package.

Mr. Speaker, let's help bring down gas prices at the pump, strengthen our Nation's rural communities, and break the grip of Big Oil by passing the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate this morning reminds me of something President Ronald Reagan once said. He said: Our friends on the other side of the aisle, they know so much that just isn't so.

How interesting it is that the title of this package is the exact opposite of what this legislation is going to do. It will do nothing to bring down the cost of food and energy. Instead, it is making excuses for the crises caused by the Biden administration's attacks on American agriculture and energy.

Now, there are a few good pieces of bipartisan legislation in this package, but our friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow these bills to receive their individual votes. Instead, they are using the good provisions here as pawns in their political messaging.

□ 1000

One of the really harmful bills in this package, as has been discussed, the Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act, creates a duplicative office within the USDA that will only add to the regulatory burden of our food processors across the country, and that is going to increase costs.

The investigator would be granted independent litigation authority, allowing for civil suits against packers at the whim of the Secretary without even consulting with the DOJ. It should be noted, the DOJ already launched an investigation into the “Big Four” for anticompetitive practices in May of 2020 and has declined to provide Congress with an update even 2 years into that investigation.

The bottom line is increasing regulation will raise food prices, not make them more affordable. Our farm families need inputs at a fair price. They need diesel prices to come down. They need to be able to produce the food to feed this country and the world without the government making it harder and harder day in and day out. That is why this package must be defeated.

Rather than more regulation, we must unleash the full ability of American production. We must work for our farm families and do what is right and defeat this bill.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), who is also the chair of our Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of my legislation, H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

Congress cannot shy away from addressing the urgent economic challenges that face our local communities

and our entire country, and that challenge continues to be inflation. We know how rising prices, consolidation across industries, and supply chain challenges are impacting America's families, businesses, and seniors, and as lawmakers, our job is to listen to the people we represent and then respond with legislation that can help solve those problems.

Indeed, this package, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, is just that. It is a compilation of bills put together by lawmakers who are responding to their constituents. I have heard from the other side of the aisle that, in fact, it would have been nice if we came together in a bipartisan way. So I would note that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle from Iowa, Arkansas, New York, Nebraska, Ohio, Illinois, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Illinois, Iowa, Tennessee—it feels like I am practicing State capitals with my fifth grader—Nebraska, Illinois, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Illinois, Nebraska, South Dakota, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Indiana, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Florida, Wyoming, Virginia, Minnesota, each of these are individual Members of Congress from the Republican side of the aisle who are leading on this issue.

In fact, two of the bills in this package are led by our Republican colleagues, and I am proud that I have joined with Congressman DUSTY JOHNSON in support of the bipartisan Butcher Block Act. I am proud to be his co-lead as he leads that important piece of legislation. It is a commonsense step toward allowing American processors the ability to expand their operations, launch a new business or just make sure they are keeping—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first step towards lowering meat prices, but in addition to increasing processing capacity for American cattlemen and poultry producers, we need to go after anticompetitive practices in the meat industry.

That is why I am proud that this package also includes the bipartisan Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act. The bill would establish a special investigator at USDA to investigate violations of our existing antitrust laws that have been on the books for more than 100 years, and I thank Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS for co-leading this effort.

This bill has broad bipartisan support and bicameral support. So I thank Senator JON TESTER, Senator GRASSLEY, Republican; Senator JOHN THUNE, Republican; Senator HOEVEN, Republican;

and Senator ROUNDS, Republican, for joining with us in pushing this bill forward. It has support from the U.S. Cattlemen's Association, and this bill is responsive to the needs of the people I represent because the Virginia Cattlemen's Association supports this bill, as does the National Farmers Union.

Americans want lower meat prices both now and in the future. They want lower gas prices and to make biofuels accessible to more Americans. We have the opportunity to do that. I urge my colleagues to support this package.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

To suggest that this bill is a collaborative effort is simply inaccurate. There could be a number of other ways to describe that as well, but it is unfortunate that we are at a place where we could have had an opportunity to advance some good legislation.

I am a supporter of the E15 bill. I have done a lot of work on this, and not just because gas prices are high right now, but because I think that E15 and allowing consumers more choices at the pump would actually engage consumers as it relates to energy policy and energy products.

I do have serious concerns, though, as others have mentioned, about provisions that the Democrats insisted be included in this bill, like the new, very duplicative investigative authority at USDA.

Even more concerning to me is Democrats' continued strategy of seeking to blame others for the situation on energy and the cost of virtually everything in our economy rather than acknowledging that President Biden's economic policies have actually created this mess.

Biden stimulus dollars have driven inflation. Biden's stimulus dollars paid Americans not to return to work, therefore, worsening our supply chain crisis. The President's executive orders canceling new lease options and shutting down the Keystone XL pipeline have certainly contributed to increased gas prices.

Real inflation relief legislation would actually reign in spending, get more Americans back to work, provide broad regulatory relief, and increase domestic energy production. This bill is certainly not it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I commend him and the members of the committee, as we just heard from Congresswoman SPANBERGER, for their very important work recognizing the needs of America's working families with their kitch-

en table issues, recognizing the needs in rural America for us to have legislation that strengthens rural America's hand in the decisions that we make as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather here, the war continues in Ukraine. It is an unprovoked, outrageous act of aggression on the part of Putin and Russia invading the territorial borders of Ukraine.

At the same time, doing that has driven up prices here at home, driven up prices at the pump; it is a Putin price at the pump. That is the main reason, in the short period of time following the invasion of Ukraine, the price at the pump went up its highest amount in a very long time.

Russia is also a source of fertilizer, a big source of fertilizer to our country, and of course, diminishing the supply coming in raises the cost of fertilizer and contributes to the cost for our farmers, and of course, then contributes to the price of food at the grocery store. It is an important kitchen table issue.

Putin's price at the pump is exacerbating the skyrocketing costs weighing heavily on our families. Again, since Russia began its saber-rattling against Ukraine, gas prices in many places went up \$2 per gallon.

Meanwhile, the World Bank reports that global food prices in March and April spiked 16 percent over the 2 months prior, and while Putin works to fuel inflation today, the Democratic House—hopefully, in a bipartisan way—takes a strong step to bring down crucial kitchen table costs at the pump and grocery store and across the board.

Our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act does precisely what the name suggests in three major areas.

First, the bill brings down the costs for farmers in the field. As we know, oil, gasoline is an important factor of production for farmers in order for them to produce. The war in Ukraine has restricted the supply of fertilizer, as I mentioned, and sent the costs through the roof. By taking action to lower the costs on the farm, we lower the costs on the shelf in the grocery store and on the kitchen table.

Second, this bill bolsters competition in the meatpacking industry, and I thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership. Cracking down on the market power of big conglomerates and increasing competition will ensure ranchers get a fair deal for their livestock while families get a good price for meat and poultry.

Third, this bill will help make cheaper, cleaner homegrown biofuels more widely available. This summer drivers who choose to fill up with Unleaded 88 could save an average of 40 cents a gallon, and by making this fuel more widely available it will unleash the power of America's farmers to help break the grip of foreign autocrats on energy markets; lower gas prices, while keeping our dollars here at home; and reduce pollution because biofuels are cleaner than petroleum.

Today's action to lower food and fuel costs is the latest manifestation of House Democrats' unyielding commitment to fight inflation.

Last month, our majority voted to hold Big Oil accountable for price gouging and war profiteering, which has kept energy prices excessively high.

This week, we passed legislation to crack down on exorbitant ocean shipping fees, leveling the playing field for American businesses and lowering costs for American consumers. Proudly today, President Biden will sign this legislation into law. It is called the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022.

As we speak, the Congress is hard at work on a bold, bipartisan, bicameral competitiveness package to make more goods in America; strengthen our supply chains; diversify our STEM workforce; and reinvigorate research and development. We look forward to sending this strong cost-cutting legislation to the President's desk.

Here is the thing: Inflation springs from higher costs. Higher costs spring from shorter supply. Shorter supply is there because of COVID preventing certain products from coming into our country, so short supply. Short supply of factors of production coming into our country.

That is why the COMPETES Act is so important because it will make us more independent, more self-sufficient on the products we need; for example, chips. Chips are a very important part of that bill. To make a car it takes 1,000 chips; an electric car, 2,000 chips. But we can't do that manufacturing unless we have chips, and if other countries are saving chips for themselves at home or the high fees of transporting them make it just unaffordable to people, we need to make these chips at home, and that is what the COMPETES Act enables us to do.

So lowering costs for our families; when we ran in 2018—just to bring back promises made—we said we were going to lower costs by lowering the costs of prescription drugs, and that is what we are in the midst of doing now. We are going to lower costs in every way for America's working families. That is what this legislation does here.

We are going to have bigger paychecks. And we have had, since President Biden took office, working with the private sector and the nonprofit sector and the public sector, 8 million jobs have been created. Unemployment has been cut in half. Wages have gone up. That also contributes to inflation, which must be addressed, and this legislation is part of doing that.

So this legislation is a strong step in that direction, and I salute the relentless leadership of the Agriculture chair, DAVID SCOTT, and the Energy and Commerce chair, FRANK PALLONE, who is an important part of this, as well as Representatives SPANBERGER, CRAIG, AXNE, and HARDER and the dedicated staff of both committees.

Together, they have assembled a package of popular bipartisan legisla-

tion with a laser focus on fighting inflation.

□ 1015

Make no mistake, a vote against this bill is a vote to keep the cost of gas and groceries high, when we can do just the opposite by voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong "yes" vote.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE), a strong agriculture advocate and a leader in agriculture.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear: just because Democrats named their bill the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act does not mean this bill will achieve that goal.

The only thing it really achieves is a campaign talking point for Democrats responding to constituents frustrated with higher prices at the grocery store and the gas station caused by their reckless spending.

Instead of wasting our valuable time debating this bill that will never become law, we should pass H.R. 8069, the Reducing Farm Input Costs and Barriers to Production Act, introduced by Ranking Member THOMPSON, which includes real, immediate solutions our farmers, ranchers, and producers support.

His bill, which I am proud to support, would reverse the EPA's reckless actions related to crop production tools, reverse the Biden administration's confusing and disastrous changes to the Waters of the United States rule, and would withdraw the SEC's ludicrous ESG rule on climate-related disclosures, an action that has received bipartisan support.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, civilians and soldiers are dying in Ukraine and the American people are feeling it in their pocket, even as they rise up to support democracy. The American people know there is a problem.

As we stand on the floor today, the good news is that Democrats care. That is why we rise today to offer the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act because the American people see it. They see it at the gas station on their way home or to work, they see it at the grocery store when their carts are half empty, and they see it with their hard-earned paychecks that don't meet what they need. Inflation—they know about it.

You know what, they are looking for a fighting team like the Democrats to make something happen, not a whining, complaining, get-nothing-done. In my community, the interest rates are 8.5 percent of the cost of goods in Houston, Texas. I am not going home and telling them that we are out here working. I ask for our colleagues to recognize the importance of lowering costs at the grocery store, ensuring ro-

bust competition, and helping farmers. Let us fight to pass this bill. We care.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, that would shore up the food and agriculture supply chain, assure fair competition in the meat and poultry sectors, and lower food and gasoline costs to the American consumer.

The American people know that there is a problem.

They see it.

They see it at the gas station on their way home from work.

They see it when they leave the grocery store with a half empty cart.

They see it when their hard-earned paychecks stretch less and less.

Inflation rose by 8.6 percent in May, a 40-year high.

The price of all goods in the Houston metro area have jumped by 8.5 percent since April 2021—the highest year-over-year jump since 1981.

My constituents aren't suddenly making 8.5 percent more than they did a year ago, mind you.

No, they are now going without.

The cost of the most basic commodities—electricity, oil, meats, and dairy—have gone up at alarming rates, and our people are disproportionately bearing the burden of inflation.

An income that previously fed and housed a family, provided life-supporting medication, and got people to work and back is now capable of paying only half of those bills.

Our constituents are forced to choose between picking up a prescription or paying for childcare, between keeping the lights on and keeping the pantry full.

These are not choices American families should have to make.

Congress must act to rebalance the financial scales in this country.

This package includes the following bills:

H.R. 7606—"Meat and Poultry Special Investigators Act" which Establishes an Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters in the Agriculture Secretary's Office.

H.R. 7764—"To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional payments under the Environmental Quality Incentives Program for implementation of nutrient management practices" which would provide additional assistance to specialty and row crop producers who undertake USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service practice standards to use fertilizers more efficiently, do soil testing, or seek out other sources of plant nutrients.

H.R. 2518—"PRECISE Act—Producing Responsible Energy and Conservation Incentives and Solutions for the Environment" which explicitly states precision agriculture eligibility in Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) and Conservation Stewardship Program, allows a producer who receives payments under EQIP to also receive a conservation loan guarantee, and allows up to a 90 percent cost share for precision agriculture under EQIP.

H.R. 1542—"Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Investment and Market Expansion Act of 2021" which would deploy additional storage and dispensing equipment to ensure that higher ethanol blends and other biofuels are more readily available across the country.

H.R. 4410—"Year-Round Fuel Choice Act of 2021" which would build on a recent Biden Administration action allowing voluntary year-

round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, known as E-15 or Unleaded 88.

H.R. 7675—"Strengthening the Agriculture and Food Supply Chain Act" which would create an Agricultural and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force at USDA, headed by a Special Advisor on Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response.

H.R. 4140—"Butcher Block Act" which would provide assistance to create new and expand current local and regional livestock and meat processing capacity with direct or guaranteed loans.

From the soil in which our farmers plant their seeds, to the fuel that transports vegetables to our grocers, to the very meat on our tables, this package will enact positive legislation that the American people will be able to see.

The spike in food and energy prices are at the center of inflation.

Beginning at the root, as producers across the country face skyrocketing fertilizer prices, we must help producers reduce their input costs so planting decisions are not impacted.

Expanding access to precision agriculture technology is critical now, as we face climate change and fertilizer costs that have doubled or almost tripled.

Breakdowns and bottlenecks in the food and agriculture supply chain, resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, have been well documented and have caused significant losses and concerns to our agricultural constituents.

Over the last few decades, there has been an influx of domination in the meat packing industry by four large companies resulting in raised prices and reduced options for products.

COVID-19 highlighted the country's dangerous reliance on large beef plants run by the four biggest processors.

The pandemic caused slaughterhouses nationwide to close to contain outbreaks of the virus among workers.

Ranchers were and still are frustrated that cattle prices drop when major plants close, while meat companies still benefit from rising meat prices.

Farmers' share of profits have gone down, while American consumers continue to pay more, with meat prices being the single largest contributor to the rising cost of food people consume at home.

A fair and competitive market is fundamental to a well-functioning U.S. economy.

When firms have to compete for customers, it leads to lower prices, higher quality goods and services, greater variety, and more innovation.

Strengthening enforcement of the Packer and Stockyards Act will lead to greater competition in the meat and poultry processing, fairer access to markets for producers, and more price stability for consumers.

Increased processing capacity will alleviate some supply chain bottlenecks and provide producers with more options to market their cattle and receive a fair price.

The supply chain will be more resilient and competitive long term as a result.

With regard to our energy and fuel crisis, further use of biofuels will reduce prices at the pump for all Americans and increase the supply of fuel available.

Biofuels adoption and investment helps reduce our reliance on foreign oil and the supply

shocks facing our gasoline supply while also bolstering a revenue stream for farmers across the country.

E-10 gasoline, gasoline containing 10 percent ethanol, is currently sold year-round, while the sale of E-15 gasoline, gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, is dependent on receiving special waivers despite both having very similar emission profiles when it comes to smog formation.

Year-round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol (E-15) will reduce the price at the pump for American drivers by giving consumers the choice to purchase a fuel that is substantially cheaper than standard gasoline.

The American people need legislative intervention in a market that is increasingly becoming more concentrated and suffering from supply chain disruptions.

This package provides small concrete actions that will invoke change and provide both short-term immediate and long-term continuous relief.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Cost Act.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a serious issue facing all of rural America: the Biden administration and the radical left's war on agriculture.

Today, the House will vote on H.R. 7606, which will exacerbate fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, all of which are hammering American consumers.

This bill is the latest attempt to scapegoat private industry rather than address the real needs and concerns of farmers, ranchers, and rural Americans. We know the Biden administration and my colleagues across the aisle see Americans in the oil and gas industry as the enemy, and I truly believe they now see farmers and ranchers as the enemy, too.

Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents back home in Texas to know that this is something I am fighting for every day. I represent the number one ag district in the State of Texas, and farmers and ranchers in my district are experiencing out-of-control input costs for fertilizer, fuel, and basic parts for equipment. I can assure you the legislation we are voting on today will make that worse.

A spending and regulatory agenda that compounds the situation further limits American ag industry's ability to meet global food demands is not the answer.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER), a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today frustrated, and to be honest, just plain tired.

For months now, my community has been paying over \$6 a gallon for gas and \$5 for a jug of milk. Prices are out of control, and it is crushing us. I talked to a neighbor the other day and she

told me she is going to have to choose between picking her kids up from school and driving herself to work, if gas prices stay this high.

Families in my neighborhood don't have the luxury of sitting around while politicians do nothing. Today, we have a chance to actually help by passing our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

This package includes my bill, which provides funding for farmers to implement nutrient management programs. These programs will help lower the cost of growing food for our farmers, so prices go back to normal at the grocery store.

Helping farmers lower costs while cutting gas prices for our families is common sense. It is beyond time that Congress put politics aside and actually listen to what our communities need. This isn't rocket science. They are asking for the government to do its job and bring these prices back down to Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope common sense prevails today, and let's pass this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a great member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in disbelief at how Washington is trying to run this economy. That is the reason I ran for office because things were so bad, and it was impossible to grow your business.

I am reminded of what we actually did when we had the House, and the Congress, and the White House. We passed the Constitutional Review Act. Through that act, we got no help from the other side, and then we passed some tax reform to give people more money to invest in their businesses.

Let me tell you what happened. For the first time in my life we became energy independent. For the first time we became an energy power. We had more jobs than people looking for jobs. So what happened now? Joe Biden was the Vice-President when I was elected. He is now the President. All those executive orders he signed stopped everything we did to put this country on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of this. I demand immediately that we stop this war on American energy that is driving up costs and stop overregulating our ag producers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has done a wonderful job as the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and I know that you are working together to bring people together. One of the things that I most admire about Chairman SCOTT is that he wants to have a bipartisan result coming out of his committee, and I think in this bill he has.

Mr. Speaker, every day Americans across the country must contend with

the rising prices caused by inflation. Whenever they pull up to the gas pump, they face the repercussions of Vladimir Putin's criminal invasion of Ukraine, which has made gas prices skyrocket—not just because of the sanctions, not because of Russia's production, but because of the lack of confidence in the future that this war has caused.

Whenever our people go to the grocery store, they suffer the consequences of the havoc that the COVID-19 pandemic has inflicted on global supply chains. Unfortunately, we cannot erase the past crises that led to our current economic situation.

I say to the Members of this Congress that we can take the meaningful steps today to lower prices for consumers and to stimulate America's economy in the weeks and months to come. That is why House Democrats are focusing all week on easing inflation and bringing costs down. I know that is what my Republican colleagues want to do as well.

While this may not be a perfect alternative—there are no perfect alternatives—this is a positive step toward decreasing the costs to our people of things that they must buy: fuel and food. To support that mission, I am proud to bring the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act to the floor today, at Mr. SCOTT's request.

America's farmers and ranchers have long fed our Nation, and indeed, much of the world. Despite their essential work, however, they have often struggled to turn a reliable profit in recent years because of rising expenses, associated particularly with fertilizer—the costs of which have gone up very substantially as a result of the crisis that we confront.

By making fertilizer more affordable and by improving farmers' access to loans for precision agricultural technology, this legislation will help lower these production costs, which burden smaller farmers and contribute to higher consumer food prices.

Additionally, this bill will lower gas prices by increasing biofuel adoption and investment, and by giving consumers greater fuel choices at the pump.

Lack of competition in the meat and poultry processing industries has also jeopardized many of our family farmers and the people they feed. Competition is the essence of a free market. Competition is the essence of establishing prices that are reasonable and fair, both to producers and to consumers.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help level that playing field for small and independent producers trying to break into the industry, which will both boost our meat processing capacity and stoke healthy competition and innovation, which both sides of the aisle believe is the way we have created this extraordinary economy we know as the American economy: competition and free markets.

Similarly, this bill establishes a dedicated office within the Department of

Agriculture to strengthen enforcement of existing antitrust authorities to consult on trade practices, ensuring a fairer, more competitive industry that works better for consumers.

We know that if just a few producers have a monopoly—and that is one of the problems with oil prices. We have OPEC nations who have constricted supply when demand was up. What inevitably happens in a free market? Prices rise.

This is about free markets. This is about competition. This is about fair pricing for consumers. These reforms will enable our farmers to produce food more efficiently, driving down costs for Americans at the grocery store.

Not only will this legislation help us respond to the ramifications of crises like the pandemic and the war in Ukraine, but they will also make our agricultural sector and our economy more resilient to future shocks.

This legislation is a crucial step toward reducing inflation. I thank Representative SPANBERGER, Representative CRAIG, and Representative AXNE, and my friends on the Republican side who have worked on this, and my friends on the Democratic side who have worked on this.

This is an important piece of legislation for the people—all of them. All of our Members listened closely to the concerns of their constituents and took a collaborative approach to come up with legislation that addresses some of the most pressing needs of the American people.

□ 1030

I thank the ranking member of this committee for his thoughtfulness in approaching this issue.

Today, every Member of this House has an opportunity to do something to ease inflation. Every Member has an opportunity to vote to ease inflation today. We are eager to take that action, which is why we are bringing this to the floor and voting to pass it.

I hope all of our Members will join us so we can show our constituents that their Congress is addressing inflation and working together on their behalf, not on our political behalves, but working together to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues: vote "yes."

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), who is another great member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7606, the higher food and increased fuel costs act.

I just cannot believe that at a time when we Americans all are paying more for everything, from gas, groceries, energy, and beyond, my colleagues on the left want more regulation and more government intervention. They want to blame Putin and

the war in Ukraine, but they don't want to accept responsibility for the very policies that are helping drive these increased costs.

If the last year has taught us anything, Mr. Speaker, it is that Big Government with a one-size-fits-all approach of spending into oblivion does not work. It turns out, shockingly, that taking cues from the Easter Bunny doesn't work.

Look at the facts: fuel, 106 percent up; eggs, 32 percent increase; fresh and frozen chicken, up 19.3 percent; milk, up 15.9 percent; bacon, up 15.6 percent; baby food, up almost 13 percent. Oh, by the way, we can't find it. Let's talk about that.

Right now, our farmers—and I know this for a fact because I come from a rural producing district—have their backs up against a wall. With skyrocketing prices for inputs like fertilizer, fuel, and feed, many of our producers are now reaching a breaking point.

This administration, however, seems hellbent on pushing them over the edge. The regulatory regime at the EPA—and I use that word deliberately—threatens the very livelihood of our producers and the long-term food security of our Nation. Everyone in this room can agree that food security is national security, and it is dangerous policy what the left is doing in taking out our producers.

Now, it seems as if they are more focused on Green New Deal policies, and our districts will never be the same if we continue down this path. Any sort of tax or additional regulation is increasing the costs to produce fuel and produce our food.

This is a time when Americans, keep in mind, are making decisions between gas or groceries, and we are seriously up here talking about increasing costs for fuel and food? Give me a break.

We need to slam the brakes on any policy that empowers more government bureaucrats and impoverishes the people.

We need to ensure that the EPA does not threaten the future of our producers with such ridiculous, out-of-touch policies. I know that many of my colleagues, particularly in leadership, have not filled up a gas tank in probably 40 years, but I have. Two days ago, I paid over \$5 per gallon of gas. That is what Americans are facing. We need to stop empowering these bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, if we adopt my motion to recommit, I will instruct the Committee on Agriculture to add my amendment that would prohibit the EPA from regulating or taxing emission from livestock.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman has the only time remaining. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to replot some of the fields and the comments that have been offered here today. One of my friends on the Agriculture Committee on the other side, Ms. SPANBERGER, claims industry support. She referenced two specific organizations. But it is certainly not widespread support among farmers and ranchers.

I will offer up this fact: Organizations that are constituted by farmers and ranchers, including the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, which is a large cattlemen's association throughout this country made up of men and women in the cattle industry, and the National Pork Producers Council are organizations that oppose this piece of legislation. The National Pork Producers Council is made up of farmers who raise hogs in so many different States in the United States of America. It is a huge industry in terms of agriculture. That organization opposes this bill.

The National Chicken Council—poultry—is huge certainly in the State of Virginia, the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of Georgia. They oppose this piece of legislation that is on the floor today. The same thing with the National Turkey Federation and the North American Meat Institute. All are in opposition to this bill that we are voting on today.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is not opposed publicly to the bill, but they have raised a litany of concerns and unanswered questions.

This bill comes with an additional price tag of \$700 million, not offset, on many of the other provisions. Quite frankly, there are zero dollars for this duplicative poison pill part of this bill, the special investigator for cattle and pork. That leaves me concerned that the existing enforcement resources that I have already made reference to with USDA and the Department of Justice is going to be drained. We are actually probably going to see less effective investigations as a result of this.

We are going to see an increase in consolidation because it is a new layer. If you are a packer of any size, not just the four big ones, but medium and small size, and you have a new cop for cows on the beat, then you are going to have to add compliance staff to be able to prepare when, quite frankly, the Department of Justice and the Packers and Stockyards Division is already doing an incredible job. Active investigations are going on.

I agree with an earlier speaker, I think it was Mr. LUCAS from Okla-

homa, if there is evidence of price-fixing and collusion, we have a regulatory mechanism and a litigation mechanism. People should be held accountable to that.

Although there are some really good parts of this bill, I am also disappointed. We know that the only way we really get legislation through the other side of the Capitol, in the Senate, is where we show cohesion and where we stick together and work together. We have complete consensus on basically all the other aspects of this bill. We did request that this bill be divided and that the special investigator portion come out of the bill.

I think we could be scoring some victories for the American people and for the American farmers. But, quite frankly, I think to be in line with President Biden, because President Biden's approach to everything, all the problems that have been created with his ill-fated policies, is that it is somebody else's fault.

This is blaming the private sector, which works hard to provide us with the food that we need. This is blaming them when, quite frankly, it is a failure to take responsibility for what has happened on day one, starting with President Biden.

We would love to work with President Biden to make sure we can address inflation, but adding this \$700 million today, I have never seen, in my lifetime anyway, or my experience, how you can spend more money and spend your way out of inflation. It just doesn't work that way. The economics do not work that way. The inflation issue, again, I have never seen inflation reduced by spending more money.

I would respectfully encourage, because we can go back to the drawing board and take each of these bills that are really good bills, the bipartisan and strong bills, we ought to take those up individually and give Congress an opportunity to speak on behalf of the American people and affirm that these are good bills. Let the special investigator stand on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "no" vote on H.R. 7606, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part F of House Report 117-366 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part F of House Report 117-366.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 1, strike "AGRICULTURE AND" and all that follows through "TASK FORCE" on line 4 and insert the following: "AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCY".

Page 7, after line 4, insert the following: "Subtitle A—Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force".

Page 12, after line 4, add the following: "Subtitle B—Addressing Fertilizer Shortages"

SEC. 311. ADDRESSING FERTILIZER SHORTAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall support and incentivize domestic activities through grants, loans, and other forms of assistance, to address fertilizer shortages and deficiencies, diversify fertilizer sources, and reduce dependency on foreign sources for fertilizer, including by—

(1) increasing the availability of innovative fertilizer and fertilizer alternatives, including nitrogen, phosphate, potassium, biological products and technologies, and other nutrients that may assist in the production of agricultural commodities;

(2) increasing materials or tools that reduce the need for fertilizer or support the more efficient use of fertilizer, including nitrogen, phosphate, potassium, biological products and technologies, and other nutrients that may assist in the production of agricultural commodities;

(3) supporting materials and facilities and research and development, that may support the purposes of this section;

(4) supporting sustainable agriculture production through the supporting production of—

(A) sustainable fertilizer produced in, or used in a manner that, reduces the greenhouse gas impact; or

(B) fertilizer produced through the use of renewable energy sources, including incentivizing greater precision in fertilizer use;

(5) supporting activities or other measures that may otherwise address competition-related challenges in the United States fertilizer market and obstacles to producers in obtaining affordable, responsibly manufactured fertilizer as referred to in the notice entitled "Access to Fertilizer: Competition and Supply Chain Concerns" published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on March 17, 2022 (87 Fed Reg. 15191 et seq.); and

(6) using the facilities and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the authorities under section 1473H of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319k).

(b) PRIORITY APPLICANTS.—In selecting activities to support under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications for such support containing proposals that the Secretary determines will most quickly address fertilizer shortages in the near term and mid-term.

(c) STREAMLINED PROCESS.—In providing assistance pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall ensure that such assistance be provided through a streamlined and expedient process (as determined necessary by the Secretary) to quickly address fertilizer shortages.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING.—Not more than 3 percent of the funding provided under this section may be used by the Secretary for administrative purposes.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available,

there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would authorize a new program at the Department of Agriculture to reduce our reliance on foreign sources of fertilizer. It is to make sure that America will be more self-sufficient and that our farmers will be more self-sufficient with our fertilizers and not dependent on Russia or foreign countries.

Everyone knows that retail fertilizer costs are at an all-time high. Putin's invasion of Ukraine is driving severe food shortages and severe fertilizer shortages. This has driven up food prices and hurt American farmers and consumers across the country. In my district, food prices are up and fertilizer prices are up.

The cost of agricultural chemicals has more than doubled since the start of the pandemic, and one of the reasons is Russia is a major exporter of nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus fertilizers.

We need to be less dependent on countries like Russia, and we need to develop these fertilizers here in the United States. That is why Congress must act on a bipartisan basis.

This amendment is common sense. It would authorize \$100 million for grants, loans, research and development, and other assistance for the Department of Agriculture to support our farmers in developing fertilizer made in the United States.

It will support sustainable and innovative domestic production of fertilizers because our fertilizers are far more sustainable and far more innovative than the fertilizers we get from other parts of the world.

It will invest in practices that reduce the use of fertilizers. One of the best things we can do for food prices and our environment is to reduce the need for fertilizers by having those fertilizers be more innovative.

The amendment also bolsters competition in the fertilizer market.

Most important, it makes us less dependent on the Russians and less dependent on the global supply chain. It will create jobs for domestic producers of fertilizers.

The Department of Agriculture is already supporting American-made fertilizers through the Commodity Credit Corporation. My amendment will expand the Department's authority so they can prioritize solutions that will most quickly address these shortages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this amendment. I thank Chairman SCOTT for working with me on this amendment. I also thank the Agriculture

Committee staff of Anne Simmons, Lyron Blum-Evitts, Prescott Martin, Josh Lobert, and Luke Theriot for their work, and Kevin Fox on my team.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentleman for bringing forth a concept that could provide relief, but not for many years.

This is an amendment to a bill that talks about immediate reduction in food prices, but this is kind of a long-term investment. I appreciate that concept, but it is not what this bill says. It really doesn't contribute to immediate relief to American consumers or reducing input costs for our farmers in the immediate or near term.

Working together is how the House Committee on Agriculture solves problems. The committee has been working together with the Department to better understand this amendment, its purpose, and its implications.

Mr. Speaker, the Department and I have agreed that this is not a near-term solution to the high price and limited availability of fertilizer.

As the gentleman knows, this amendment was pulled from consideration by my Democratic colleagues in a recent committee markup.

□ 1045

Unfortunately, we have not learned much since then, which furthers my opposition to it. Growing the size of government by codifying the Biden administration's half-baked initiatives, authorizing \$100 million, specifying further use of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and minimally funded research programs is no way to tackle rising inflation or to address skyrocketing fertilizer costs. In fact, it leaves us in a rather more tenuous situation when it comes to our farmers.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is what we use and what we depend on and rely on when our farmers fall on difficult times. And they are there, these input costs.

Not in all commodities but in most commodities, we see a record price that they are getting for their commodity. But the fact is that agriculture is a business. Farming is a business. Ranching is a business. At the end of the day, it is the margin. It is not what you get paid. You have to consider what you are paying in input costs.

With this inflation, with these types of policies we are talking about today, there will be many commodities that soon will be upside down. They will be more expensive to produce than what they are able to get for price. There are commodities that are already at that point.

Draining the CCC in any year, in 2022, is not only wrong; it is dangerous. We

are not going to have the resources to be able to help our farmers to keep them farming and to use the CCC for what its primary purpose and mission was about.

Even more perplexing is the idea we would want to solidify in law concepts that USDA admittedly has not developed into programming or policy, as the public comment period was just extended yet again.

Now, we would have been better served by considering Republican amendments, all of which would have provided immediate relief through reversing the regulatory assault stifling the innovation and exacerbating strained supply chains.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I respect the ranking member. We have worked together on a number of initiatives.

I would just say that this amendment, by giving the Commodity Credit Corporation resources, is helping make things in America. Whether it is immediate or whether it is over the next few months, we should have a bipartisan consensus that we ought to be making more things in this country and be less dependent on Russia and foreign sources.

While I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, I also hope that we can continue to work with the other side to find common ground over this Congress so that we can get bipartisan support for an effort to build more fertilizer in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman offered an amendment. He is a good friend. We do work together. Another area of jurisdiction on the Agriculture Committee that shocks people, actually, is cryptocurrency because it is a commodity and traded and overseen by CFTC. He has been such a great partner as we have worked together with those solutions.

The whole concept of bipartisan work, it is alive and well in the Agriculture Committee, but just not reflected with this poison pill that is in this particular piece of legislation.

With this amendment, I think, as I said before, yes, we need to be looking long term. But this legislation we are dealing with today, according to the Democrats, is supposed to have an immediate reduction in inflation.

While I believe we do need to do an investment long term and look at other methods of producing fertilizer, this doesn't really fit with reducing prices for American families today. To do it and do it right, we really do need USDA on board. We need to have their input. We need to have their ability to do this through their programming.

This is something I look forward to continuing to work on with the gentleman. I continue to voice my opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part F of House Report 117-366.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 1, strike “**AGRICULTURE AND**” and all that follows through “**TASK FORCE**” on line 4 and insert the following: “**AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCY**”.

Page 7, after line 4, insert the following: “**Subtitle A—Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force**”.

Page 12, after line 4, add the following:

Subtitle B—American Food Supply Chain Resiliency

SEC. 311. SUPPLY CHAIN REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**Subtitle H—Food Supply Chain Resiliency**

“SEC. 298. SUPPLY CHAIN REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, shall enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities to establish not fewer than 6 Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers to support small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and small-sized and medium-sized agricultural businesses through activities, which may include—

“(1) offering coordination, technical assistance, and capacity building support to small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and agricultural businesses;

“(2) supporting supply chain and value chain coordination—

“(A) in the region in which such producers or businesses are located; and

“(B) with the Department of Agriculture, other Federal, State, and Tribal agencies with relevant resources, regional commissions, and other Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers;

“(3) providing technical assistance to such producers and businesses;

“(4) providing grants or other financial assistance to such producers and businesses looking to expand production or a business or start production or a business in such region; and

“(5) carrying out such other activities as may be specified by the Secretary.

“(b) FOCUS ON TRIBAL SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES.—At least one Supply Chain Regional Resource Center established pursuant to sub-

section (a) shall provide coordination, assistance, and capacity building support to address supply chain issues faced by Indian tribes and Tribal organizations (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity (including an entity representing a partnership) seeking to enter into a cooperative agreement under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including how the Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers established by such entity will address food and agricultural supply chain issues faced by underserved communities.

“(2) REGIONAL DIVERSITY.—In selecting eligible entities to enter into a cooperative agreement under this section, the Secretary shall ensure the regional diversity of such entities.

“(d) TERM.—The term of a cooperative agreement entered into under this section shall be not less than 4 years.

“(e) COORDINATION.—A Supply Chain Regional Resource Center shall, as a condition on entering into a cooperative agreement under this section, agree to coordinate with other Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers, when appropriate.

“(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on—

“(1) with respect to the activities carried out by the Secretary under this section—

“(A) a description of such activities; and

“(B) the impact of such activities on supply chain issues faced by small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products; and

“(2) with respect to the activities carried out by the Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers under this section—

“(A) a description of such activities;

“(B) the impact of such activities on supply chain issues faced by small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and agricultural businesses; and

“(C) any grants awarded by Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers to such producers and businesses.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State government (or a political subdivision thereof), regional authority, or an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization;

“(B) a college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)) (including a land-grant college or university); or

“(C) a nonprofit organization, including a producer network or association, a food council, an economic development corporation, or another organization.

“(2) STATE.—The term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103).

“(h) FUNDING.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026.

“(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to undermine or narrow the authority of the Secretary to carry out activities described in

subsection (a) under any other authority of the Secretary.”.

SEC. 312. AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTERS PROGRAM.

Section 6402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) applied research, technical assistance, support services, outreach, and other services to strengthen, maintain, and secure supply chains related to value-added agricultural commodities and products produced in the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my amendment to include the American Food Supply Chain Resiliency Act in H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Cost Act. I thank Congressman ANTHONY GONZALEZ of Ohio for his partnership on this bipartisan legislation.

Supply chain disruptions are impacting the operations of businesses in Virginia and across the country, leaving shelves empty and driving up prices for consumers. For crop and livestock producers, as well as agribusinesses, the current disruptions are a threat to their livelihoods and their ability to deliver high-quality products at an affordable price while still making ends meet.

Meanwhile, Americans are suffering from rising food prices at grocery stores, dollar stores, and restaurants. Rising inflation makes trips to the grocery store more and more stressful as the price of staple items like meat, eggs, and vegetables rise, sometimes going up monthly, even weekly.

Americans have shared the experience of going to the grocery store—we all have—picking up our favorite food items that we have purchased for years and thinking, well, this is more expensive than last week. My husband and I were just talking about this issue over the weekend as we changed our own shopping list because of it.

Few products are more essential than the foods we eat. Farmers, particularly small- and medium-sized producers, have been left out of investments that are meant to mitigate supply chain challenges, and that has meant it is getting more difficult to get products from the farm to the market and, finally, to the table.

While big companies have the budget to invest in supply chain innovations, research, and experts, small- and medium-sized producers are paying higher prices than ever for fertilizer, fuel, shipping, and other input costs.

When farmers pay more to produce food, all Americans pay more at the

grocery store. That is why we must empower USDA to do more to resolve farmers' and food businesses' supply chain challenges. We must be prepared.

To address these concerns, I was proud to lead the bipartisan American Food Supply Chain Resiliency Act. This legislation would establish supply chain regional resource centers through cooperative agreements with the Agricultural Marketing Service at USDA.

These resource centers would offer locally tailored coordination, technical assistance, and grants to small- and medium-sized producers and agribusinesses, leading to stronger supply chains. This bill would also expand the great work of the Agriculture Innovation Program to include research and support on supply chains.

By establishing supply chain regional resource centers, this bill would provide additional support to family farmers and food businesses trying to deliver their goods at a lower price for consumers. These centers would help local producers get through lean years, obtain the inputs they need, and address challenges related to transportation costs, labor, and high energy prices.

In fact, USDA has already taken similar steps to build collaboration across sectors of local and regional food supply chains through regional centers. Our bipartisan legislation would support and build on these centers, as well as make sure they are a wise, tailored investment with a clear mission and fair reporting requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan bill. Once again, I thank Congressman GONZALEZ for his partnership.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Virginia for bringing forth an idea, and I do wish the same courtesy had been extended to my Republican colleagues who were denied the opportunity to bring their amendments forward for debate.

Working together is how the House Committee on Agriculture solves problems, and the committee has been working together with the Department to better understand this amendment, its purpose, and its implications.

As the gentlewoman knows, this amendment was pulled from consideration by my Democrat colleagues in a recent committee markup. Unfortunately, we have not learned much since then, which furthers my opposition to it being considered prematurely on the floor today.

I cannot support this amendment as written, an amendment that falls short of its advertised goals, and does not

offer any immediate relief to farmers, ranchers, or consumers, because that is the myth that my Democrat friends are trying to sell with the overall bill today, which will not happen. In fact, I am afraid inflationary costs, more concentration, are going to occur as a result of a specific part of the package.

Growing the size of government by codifying the Biden administration's half-baked initiatives is no way to tackle rising inflation or address rising fuel and fertilizer costs.

Even more perplexing is the idea that we would want to solidify in law concepts that USDA admittedly has not developed into programming or policy.

Now, we would have been better served by considering Republican amendments, all of which would have provided immediate relief through reversing the regulatory assault stifling innovation and exacerbating strained supply chains.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned that this bill will not provide immediate relief, and I concur. This bill is not meant to provide immediate relief. The amendment before us would plan for the future and would recognize that we face disruptions in our supply chain, and frequently, when we do, it is our farmers and producers who are impacted, particularly smaller and medium-sized producers like those in our districts.

This bill, this amendment to the larger bill, is an issue of planning for the future, recognizing disruptions that may come, and being able to proactively plan for such challenges.

It is unfortunate that the gentleman feels that they were left out of the process, but I am heartened that the scope of concern relates to the process and not the underlying amendment.

This amendment is about long-term planning. It is about ensuring that our smaller and medium-sized producers and agribusinesses have the technical assistance, the support, and the coordination that they will need to weather challenges in supply chain disruptions that may occur today, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, in my comments, I said it was premature, and I do believe it is. I think that this is a concept that the gentlewoman is pursuing that is worthy of consideration, worthy of development and full development so that we can have an appropriate consideration of the text of this particular amendment.

I also think it is out of place with this particular bill because the context, the pretext that my Democratic

friends are presenting here, is a false promise that whatever would pass, and if this would somehow find a pathway through the Senate and be implemented, that it would immediately lower food and fuel costs. That is just not the case.

This is more of a long-term vision. I appreciate that because I think we should be looking long term when it comes to the needs of input costs for our farmers because, quite frankly, when we have inflation, when we have burdensome regulations, when we have an administration that is really out of control from a regulatory perspective, sidelining their scientists at the EPA—which, by the way, actually, part of those are funded under a public-private partnership with agribusinesses to make sure that farmers can have access to crop protection tools, significant crop protection tools that have been sidelined by this administration, when these same scientists have found them to be safe in application in the past.

What I would say is that I look forward to working with the gentlewoman in the future on this concept, but I continue to remain in opposition.

This is not quite ready for prime time, not ready for consideration. We need to be working more. We need more time working in a bipartisan way and, quite frankly, hearing from the administration as well and USDA.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is no disagreement that across America's regions and across our commodities, our Nation's farmers and ranchers have gotten the short end of the stick, particularly when it comes to rising input costs as a result of supply chain bottlenecks and inflation.

The Lowering Food and Fuel Costs Act and this amendment take crucial, commonsense steps toward addressing these challenges, both now and into the future, planning for a future where we can be proactive, continually so, and ensure that small and targeted investments from USDA today can have impacts on small- and medium-sized producers' ability to get food to market and improve their bottom lines.

At the same time, these investments should also lead to lower food prices for Americans at the grocery store, convenience stores, and restaurants.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment. I look forward to working with my colleague across the aisle to receive additional, very specific feedback on how we can make some of these provisions stronger, better with that input into the future.

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment in front of us and, ultimately, "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I continue to offer my opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Cammack of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7606 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. CAMMACK is as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not promulgate or implement any regulation under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) imposing the collection of a fee, or requiring any source to obtain a permit under title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.), for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage. This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 218, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—206

Aderholt	Arrington	Baird
Allen	Babin	Balderson
Amodei	Bacon	Banks

Barr	Gosar	Moolenaar	Jeffries	Meng	Schneider
Bentz	Granger	Mooney	Johnson (GA)	Mfume	Schrader
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)	Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)	Schrier
Bice (OK)	Graves (MO)	Moore (UT)	Jones	Morelle	Scott (VA)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Mullin	Kahele	Moulton	Scott, David
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Murphy (NC)	Kaptur	Mrvan	Sewell
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Nehls	Keating	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Boehert	Grothman	Newhouse	Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Sherrill
Bost	Guest	Norman	Khanna	Napolitano	Sires
Brady	Guthrie	Obornolte	Kildee	Neal	Slotkin
Brooks	Harris	Owens	Kilmer	Neguse	Smith (WA)
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Palazzo	Kim (NJ)	Newman	Soto
Buck	Hartzler	Palmer	Kind	Norcross	Spanberger
Bucshon	Hern	Pence	Kirkpatrick	O'Halleran	Speier
Budd	Herrrell	Perry	Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Stansbury
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Pfluger	Kuster	Omar	Stanton
Burgess	Hice (GA)	Posey	Lamb	Pallone	Stevens
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler	Langevin	Panetta	Strickland
Cammack	Hill	Rice (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Pappas	Suozzi
Carey	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)	Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Swalwell
Carl	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)	Lawrence	Payne	Takano
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rogers (KY)	Lawson (FL)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rose	Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Cawthorn	Issa	Rosendale	Lee (NV)	Peters	Titus
Chabot	Jackson	Rouzer	Leger Fernandez	Phillips	Tlaib
Cheney	Jacobs (NY)	Roy	Levin (CA)	Pingree	Tonko
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford	Levin (MI)	Pocan	Torres (CA)
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Salazar	Lieu	Porter	Torres (NY)
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Scalise	Lofgren	Pressley	Trahan
Cole	Jordan	Schweikert	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Trone
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin	Luria	Quigley	Underwood
Conway	Joyce (PA)	Sessions	Lynch	Raskin	Vargas
Crawford	Katko	Simpson	Malinowski	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Crenshaw	Keller	Smith (MO)	Maloney,	Ross	Velázquez
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)	Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz
Davis, Rodney	Kim (CA)	Smucker	Manning	Ruppersberger	Waters
DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Spartz	Matsui	Rush	Watson Coleman
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Stauber	McBath	Ryan	Welch
Donalds	LaHood	Steel	McCollum	Sánchez	Wexton
Duncan	LaMalfa	Stefanik	McEachin	Sarbanes	Wild
Dunn	Lamborn	Steil	McGovern	Scanlon	Williams (GA)
Elizy	Latta	Steube	McNerney	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Emmer	LaTurner	Stewart	Meeks	Schiff	Yarmuth
Estes	Lesko	Taylor			
Fallon	Letlow	Tenney			
Feenstra	Long	Thompson (PA)	Armstrong	Costa	Zeldin
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Tiffany	Casten	Garcia (CA)	
Fischbach	Lucas	Timmons			
Fitzgerald	Luetkemeyer	Turner			
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Upton			
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Valadao			
Fox	Mann	Van Drew			
Franklin, C.	Massie	Van Duyn			
Scott	Mast	Wagner			
Fulcher	McCarthy	Walberg			
Gaetz	McCaul	Walorski			
Gallagher	McClain	Waltz			
Garbarino	McClintock	Weber (TX)			
Gibbs	McHenry	Webster (FL)			
Gimenez	McKinley	Wenstrup			
Gohmert	Meijer	Westerman			
Gonzales, Tony	Meuser	Williams (TX)			
Gonzalez (OH)	Miller (IL)	Wilson (SC)			
Good (VA)	Miller (WV)	Wittman			
Gooden (TX)	Miller-Meeks	Womack			

NAYS—218

Adams	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	F.
Allred	McCormick	Escobar
Auchincloss	Chu	Eshoo
Axne	Cicilline	Espallat
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Evans
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Beatty	Cleaver	Foster
Bera	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Beyer	Cohen	Galleo
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Cooper	Garcia (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Garcia (TX)
Bonomici	Courtney	Golden
Bordeaux	Craig	Gomez
Bowman	Crist	Gonzalez,
Boyle, Brendan	Crow	Vicente
F.	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brown (MD)	Davids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
Brown (OH)	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Brownley	Dean	Harder (CA)
Bush	DeFazio	Hayes
Bustos	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	DeLauro	Himes
Carbajal	DelBene	Horsford
Cárdenas	Demings	Houlahan
Carson	DeSaunier	Hoyer
Carter (LA)	Deutsch	Huffman
Cartwright	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Case	Doggett	Jacobs (CA)
Castor (FL)		Jayapal

NOT VOTING—5

Armstrong	Costa	Zeldin
Casten	Garcia (CA)	

□ 1139

Mses. TLAIB, OMAR, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY, Messrs. THOMPSON of California, LEVIN of California, CLEAVER, Ms. CHU, Mr. PASCARELL, Mses. JACKSON LEE, SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Messrs. RUSH, SHERMAN, and O'HALLERAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GRAVES of Louisiana, COLE, and BANKS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Doggett (Beyer)	Lawrence
(Balderson)	Evans (Beyer)	(Stevens)
Bergman	Garcia (IL)	Lawson (FL)
(Stauber)	(Takano)	(Wasserman
Blunt Rochester	Gohmert (Weber	Schultz)
(Brown (MD))	(TX))	Lieu (Beyer)
Bonomici (Beyer)	Gomez (Huffman)	Long
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez (OH)	(Fleischmann)
F. (Neguse)	(Meijer)	Loudermilk
Brooks (Weber	Guest	(Fleischmann)
(TX))	(Fleischmann)	Mace (Carter
Brownley	Johnson (GA)	(GA))
(Kuster)	(Manning)	McEachin
Bustos (Mrvan)	Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)
Cárdenas	(Jeffries)	Moore (WI)
(Correa)	Kahele (Mrvan)	(Beyer)
Carter (TX)	Katko (Moore	Newman (Beyer)
(Weber (TX))	(UT))	Palazzo
Crist	Kelly (IL)	(Fleischmann)
(Wasserman	(Neguse)	Payne (Pallone)
Schultz)	Krishnamoorthi	Peters (Jeffries)
Davids (KS)	(Neguse)	Pingree
(Neguse)	Lamb (Neguse)	(Wasserman
Davis, Danny K.	LaMalfa	Schultz)
(Beyer)	(Valadao)	Porter (Neguse)

Price (NC)
(Manning)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Sires (Pallone)
Stanton
(Huffman)
Suoizzi (Beyer)

Swalwell
(Correa)
Taylor (Van
Duyne)
Tenney
(Jackson)
Titus (Pallone)
Trahan (Stevens)

Wagner
(McHenry)
Walorski
(Bucshon)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)

Suoizzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)

Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Boyle, Brendan
F. (Neguse)
Brooks (Weber
(TX))
Brownley
(Kuster)
Bustos (Mrvan)
Cárdenas
(Correa)
Carter (TX)
(Weber (TX))
Costa (Correa)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Davids (KS)
(Neguse)
Davis, Danny K.
(Beyer)
Doggett (Beyer)
Evans (Beyer)
Garcia (IL)
(Takano)
Gohmert (Weber
(TX))
Gomez (Huffman)
Gonzalez (OH)
(Meijer)
Guest
(Fleischmann)
Johnson (GA)
(Manning)

Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Katko (Moore
(UT))
Kelly (IL)
(Neguse)
Krishnamoorthi
(Neguse)
Lamb (Neguse)
LaMalfa
(Valadao)
Lawrence
(Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Lieu (Beyer)
Long
(Fleischmann)
Loudermilk
(Fleischmann)
Mace (Carter
(GA))
McEachin
(Beyer)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Payne (Pallone)

Peters (Jeffries)
Pingree
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Porter (Neguse)
Price (NC)
(Manning)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Sires (Pallone)
Stanton
(Huffman)
Suoizzi (Beyer)
Swalwell
(Correa)
Taylor (Van
Duyne)
Tenney
(Jackson)
Titus (Pallone)
Trahan (Stevens)
Wagner
(McHenry)
Walorski
(Bucshon)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—221

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans

Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath

McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Lee (CA)
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gibbs

NAYS—204

Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Lesko
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NOT VOTING—4

Garcia (CA)
Zeldin

□ 1156

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei
(Balderson)

Bergman
(Stauber)

Blunt Rochester
(Brown (MD))
Bonamici (Beyer)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5828

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 5828.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The gentleman's request is accepted.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1735

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

□ 1200

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2374

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) as cosponsor of H.R. 2374, the Peace and Tolerance in Palestinian Education Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the House majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, before I start on the colloquy and go through the schedule, I was just talking to the Republican whip, my friend, Mr. SCALISE. We were talking about a friend of ours, his name is John Bresnahan; he is

a reporter. He has covered Capitol Hill since 1994, I believe, is the note I had. He is an excellent reporter.

He reports the facts. He reports the truth. As I know Mr. SCALISE agrees, reporters who do that not only serve us, but more importantly, their major purpose is to serve the American people because we know that a free press telling the facts and the truth to the American people give them the opportunity to make solid decisions for our democracy.

I wish John Bresnahan a happy 60th birthday, and hope that he has many, many more. I have had 23 more than that, so I appreciate the fact that he is still going strong.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the confession about how many 60th birthdays he has shared. Here is to many more for you, but also for Bres.

As the gentleman points out, a fair and free press is vital to democracy. It is the First Amendment to our Constitution: freedom of speech and freedom of the press. While they might not report our press releases verbatim all the time—as we might like them to—they serve a vital purpose. Bres is one of those that we see in the halls, like the press that is around here making sure that the country knows what is happening here in the greatest democracy of the history of the world.

As a 60th birthday gift to him, I promise not to sing “Happy Birthday” to him. I wish Bres a happy birthday, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to tell Mr. Bresnahan that he made the same promise to me, which is why we did this. If he was going to sing it, I was a little reluctant to do this, and he didn't. I join the whip in wishing John Bresnahan, a friend, a very careful and honest reporter, the very best 60th birthday and many more to come.

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, on Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

On Monday, we will be celebrating Juneteenth as a Federal holiday for the second time in American history. Juneteenth is the day on which the last slaves who were in Texas learned of their new status as free Americans, an extraordinary day in the history of our country, eliminating one of the great blights on the history of America. As de Tocqueville pointed out, we tried to heal our wounds and tried to heal our wrongs, and we are still working on that.

Last year, the Congress took the historic step of enacting legislation to recognize Juneteenth as a Federal holiday, at long last. I look forward to

celebrating as we pay tribute to freedom to all men and women being created equal in the image of God. We celebrate the history of the African-American perseverance and triumph over injustice and adversity.

I say triumph—it has been a triumph—but there are battles yet to be won. Juneteenth not only looks back but it looks forward to winning those battles.

Madam Speaker, I see Mr. GREEN on the floor, who has a resolution on the recognition of the blight of slavery. I thank him for that resolution and look forward to having that considered.

On Monday, we will be celebrating that holiday, but we will be celebrating it as we do Martin Luther King's birthday, as we ought to be in celebrating Washington and Lincoln's birthday, and committing ourselves to the realization of the principles for which they stood.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of those suspension bills will be announced at the close of business tomorrow.

Next week, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 7666, which is titled Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act, a bipartisan package of bills led by Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member McMorris Rodgers, to address the mental health and opioid abuse crisis.

The legislation expands access to treatment for opioid use disorders, promotes behavioral health integration, and reauthorizes critical programs to support mental health and substance use disorder, prevention, treatment, and recovery, including in our children.

Madam Speaker, the House will also consider legislation under suspension from Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and members of the Education and Labor Committee to address the mental health, addiction, and suicide on college campuses, which is far, far too prevalent.

Our young people have faced stresses by the pandemic, stresses within our Nation, the divisions on which prey on their minds, so this is a very important piece of legislation. I hope it will be—and I believe it is going to be—bipartisan.

The House will also take up H.R. 6411, the Veterans Affairs' Committee Chairman MARK TAKANO's STRONG Veterans Act, again, bipartisan legislation to combat veterans' suicide and address mental health, and help our Nation meet its commitment to those who risk their lives and safety for our country.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5585, Representatives Eshoo's ARPA-H Act. This legislation would establish the Advanced Research Project Agency for Health, an independent agency tasked with accelerating biomedical innovation and making transformative breakthroughs in the fight against the most challenging diseases confronting our people.

This agency will oversee the next steps in the Cancer Moonshot program and help meet the President's goal of cutting the cancer death rate by at least 50 percent over the next 25 years, and hopefully sooner.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Pride Month, the House will consider H.R. 4176, the LGBTQ Data Inclusion Act.

Madam Speaker, I anticipate that the House will vote on a compromised, bipartisan Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our PACT Act, after the Senate takes action on the version agreed upon in May. As the whip knows, that Act was a bipartisan act that dealt with those who were exposed to burn pits and other toxic substances of which they did not know while they were serving on bases, both here and around the world.

This bill, we believe the Senate will take action on, a version agreed upon in May, which preserves much of the House-passed legislation to care for veterans exposed to burn pits and other toxic chemicals during their service.

In addition, the House will consider other bills under suspension of the rules, the complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Additional legislative items are possible.

□ 1215

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that update. As we celebrate Juneteenth next week, also right here in this House Chamber over 150 years ago is where the 13th Amendment to the Constitution was debated and passed. So history is made here on a regular basis. And then we celebrate the freedoms that result and continue as our Founders talked about to aspire towards a more perfect Nation so we will do that next week.

I do want to thank the gentleman because last week during this colloquy I know I asked my friend if we could bring the Supreme Court protection bill, the bill to make sure that Supreme Court Justices and their families get proper protection, as we were watching and saw a man arrested for trying to murder a Supreme Court Justice. Leader MCCARTHY, I know, urged that as well. So I appreciate that we got to bring that bill up, debate it, and quickly pass it to President Biden's desk where we can get that in place.

I would hope that the Attorney General, Merrick Garland, would start enforcing 18 U.S. Code 1507 to give protection properly as Federal laws dictate, but it is not being enforced at the homes of those Justices. But, again, I appreciate that we got a very overwhelming bipartisan vote on that bill this week.

Does the gentleman have anything to add before we talk about the schedule for next week?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply observe, as I observed the other day, that we all want to make sure that our Justices are safe.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, there is a very important reason for that. We want to keep all our people safe. But nine Justices of our Supreme Court represent that we are a nation of laws. They are one of the three branches of our government. Just as I was extraordinarily concerned about the attack on this institution, the Congress of the United States, as we were preparing to elect a President of the United States, an attack on the Supreme Court and the lives of the Supreme Court Justices are an attack on our democracy, on a separate branch of government that is charged with continuing to make us a nation of laws.

So, very frankly, the Supreme Court Justices, under existing law, were protected. There were security people there. Luckily, there were security people there. But the gentleman is absolutely right. We want to make sure whether we agree or disagree with the individuals, whether we agree or disagree with the opinions or the judgments that Congress makes, we are a nation of laws, and the way to resolve our differences is not through violence but through the democratic process.

I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SCALISE. I share those comments by the gentleman from Maryland.

As we look towards next week—we have had this conversation a number of times—one of the items I don't see on the agenda is an item to address the problem of high gas prices, and, of course, we have now crossed an average of more than \$5 a gallon. It is a major burden for families, especially lower-income families who are being forced more and more to make those tough decisions of can they even afford to drive to work, and can they even afford to drive to see their doctor or to drive to the grocery store where they are paying maybe 20 percent more for some of the food items.

We have had a bill for over a month now, H.R. 6858, that would address these problems and allow us to actually have more control over our own energy production in America, to be able to drill in America for energy to lower the cost of gasoline, by confronting so many of the problems that this Biden administration has imposed that are making it hard for us to produce more energy in America to the point where you now have President Biden announcing that he is going to go to Saudi Arabia to beg them to produce more oil.

As we try to confront this challenge—and again, H.R. 6858 would allow us to do that—if you look at President Biden's proposed trip to Saudi Arabia, the President likes talking a lot about carbon footprints, carbon emissions, and global warming.

Why would the President get on Air Force One and fly 5,700 miles to Saudi

Arabia to beg them to do something that we can do right here in America?

In fact, he could go less than 1,000 miles to Port Fourchon, Louisiana, in my district where they can produce hundreds of thousands of barrels a day in America which, by the way, because America has the best standards in the world, would emit less carbon than the oil produced in Saudi Arabia.

While the President will be flying over to Saudi Arabia, he won't know the answer he is going to get. They are an OPEC nation. They typically support a limited supply of oil because they want a higher price. So he doesn't know what the answer is going to be. He is going to fly 5,700 miles over and another 5,700 miles back to the United States. There are no solar panels on Air Force One, so that is going to be a lot of jet fuel and a lot of carbon emissions to do something that he could pick up the phone and call Port Fourchon. We would love to see him down there, but he can call them. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, the answer would be "yes."

They would say: Yes, we will produce more energy here in America.

But they are not allowed to right now because of limitations put in place by the Biden administration. So while we push to get this bill, H.R. 6858, brought forward, it really begs the question of first: What is the carbon footprint of President Biden's trip to Saudi Arabia?

But why even do this trip? Why go to Saudi Arabia and ask them to produce oil when we have it right here?

It is President Biden's policies that are stopping that oil from being produced, and, by the way, at a much lower carbon footprint than anything that Saudi Arabia, Russia, Venezuela, or any of those countries would produce if it were their countries meeting the demands of our Nation and so many others.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, hopefully, to see if we can get the bill scheduled for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We continue to talk about this as if this were the President's fault. First of all, in a much wider range, this is a result of the pandemic.

Why is it the result of the pandemic?

Not solely the pandemic but let me take the pandemic first. Everybody stayed home—this body and businesses across America.

What did that mean that they stayed home?

They stopped buying gas.

What did the oil companies do?

They shut down some of their production, a very substantial reduction in production. But then as the prices went up, they were making as much money or much more money. So in making much more money, they didn't increase production, as the gentleman says will be an answer to the question, in a country that does, in fact, have regulations and does have rules, and

because of those regulations and rules the production of our energy is, in fact, as the gentleman asserts, more efficient and more environmentally considerate.

The oil companies—acting from what they thought was good business practice, demand was down, but prices were going up—were making profits. They bought back stock, which, of course, increased the value of the stock that remained. They increased dividends, which, of course, encouraged people to invest in them. It made people happy about their investments.

But they didn't increase production. They didn't have to increase production. They were making good profits and making, from their standpoint, good business decisions.

As I indicated in the last colloquy that we dealt with this problem, there were millions of leases put on the market by this administration, as I recall, some 80 million acres. Approximately 2 percent of the leases were bid on, and then the Court said that this was not a legal process.

But it is interesting how small was the interest in additional production at that time irrespective of what happened subsequently.

The gentleman mentions a bill, as he has done in the past, H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

But before I say that, let me say, I hope the President is going to Saudi Arabia to talk privately, not publicly trying to embarrass or harangue, and certainly not to beg. The United States of America doesn't need to beg any nation in the world, and this President is not begging anybody.

This President should say, however, Madam Speaker: Saudis, stop controlling the supply unreasonably and driving the prices up of your product.

Yes, they are making more money, and they have a cartel. That is called a monopoly. That cartel has made sure that the lack of supply drove up the international market price. And then Russia went to war.

Now, Russia going to war has affected to some degree the supply of oil, but, very frankly, buying Russian oil supports their criminal war effort, their vicious and murderous war effort. We are all against that. So we agreed that we would not take any oil, and we urged our European allies not to rely on it either.

Now, what did that create?

It created a lack of confidence in the stability of the market.

What happens when you have lack of confidence in the stability of a market?

Prices go up because it is a bet on what is going to happen with the price of that product in the future that the market really reflects.

Now, the reason I say it that way is because these are not Biden prices. Even if tomorrow we snapped a finger and said: "Okay, go ahead," nothing would happen tomorrow, nothing would

happen next week, and nothing would happen next month. It would take a substantial period of time because the oil companies, based upon the lack of demand, shut down, nor did they pursue further production.

Now, let me say something about the price of oil. The national price of oil now does not reflect the increase as part of the market response to what is called the West Texas Intermediary, which I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana, an oil-producing State, knows much more about than I do.

But let me say this: In 2008, that benchmark for crude oil peaked at \$147.02 in July of 2008. Adjusted for inflation, that is \$199.57 today.

In that time, 2008, the average U.S. gasoline peaked at \$4.14 per gallon. Adjusted for inflation, that would be \$5.62 today.

So, in other words, in 2008, otherwise known as the last year of the Bush administration, gasoline prices were higher than they are today notwithstanding the fact that the world price was \$31 less.

Excuse me, yesterday, June 15, that West Texas Intermediary oil—the benchmark for crude oil prices—was \$116 a barrel, \$31 less, without accounting for inflation, which would make it greater than it was in 2008. That wasn't George Bush's fault. It was the international market's fault and also this cartel that controls a large part of the supply of the oil in our country.

Now, my point—I still have to deal with H.R. 6858. One of its tenets is to approve the Keystone pipeline. The problem with that is, for whatever reason—and I understand my friend will have a response, Madam Speaker, as to well, because you disapproved it, meaning the Obama administration. They want to open the Keystone pipeline. The problem is the company that had the Keystone pipeline has abandoned it. Even if it were approved, they would have to get back in business and we would be well over a year—well over a year.

Now, I happen to have agreed that we should have approved that pipeline. I have said that publicly. I said that to the press. That didn't happen. But it would not solve the problem. And particularly, when you look at the figures that I just gave with respect to the world market price, we are paying a lot more now than we did in 2008 when it was higher.

So I would say to my friend, he also had a provision that expedites the LNG facility approval process. One of the problems we had is 20 percent of the LNG export capacity is now shut down.

□ 1230

It was shut down because the regulations that the gentleman speaks of, correctly, were not followed, and the LNG plant had an explosion. It shut down because it violated regulations that were imposed upon it.

What I would say to my friend—I have talked to the committee about his

bill. The LNG process is working. As I told him, I have an LNG export plant in my district, which has changed from substantial exports to the Pacific region, and now, 80 percent is going to Europe to try to bridge that gap as the Europeans retreat from being dependent upon Russian oil.

I tell my friend, with all due respect—and I am not going to plead with him, but I am going to suggest to him—we are going to Saudi Arabia, I hope, to tell them in private: Look, this is not a game you want to be playing. You are making our consumers pay far more.

We have acted. We acted, and we passed, some time ago, a bill that said you cannot have gas prices that are set at unreasonable levels, which we know as gouging. It is like you have a flood in your city and 80 percent of the grocery stores are wiped out, and the grocery stores that remain triple their prices. That is called gouging. We passed that bill.

We also passed a bill today which, unfortunately, most Republicans voted against—"most," I say, not all—which will, again, seek to bring the price down at the pump. How? By utilizing American products to supplement and expand the supply of gas and, we believe, bring the price of a gallon down some 40 cents—that is what the experts say—if we continue to use a mix of fuel.

But let me say in closing, on these remarks, which I know have been relatively lengthy, we are in this together, Republicans and Democrats.

FOX News criticized me for saying we are at war. We just sent a billion dollars for a war we are not in because we believe in freedom. We believe in international law.

We believe that we have a dictator, a dangerous dictator, who is committing war crimes through his men and women in eastern Ukraine in particular and did it in western Ukraine as they came into Kyiv.

We are in this together, one Nation, one America, on behalf of freedom. We have taken tough action. As part of that, we are paying the price at the pump because of that invasion.

The pandemic shut down production and shut down the purchase of gasoline by people because they didn't go to work. They didn't need to get in their cars. They didn't need to commute.

I would simply say to my friend that we are on the same team. Our President is leading our effort to defeat this despot, to stop this war, to ensure the freedom not only of the Ukrainian people but of all people, and to ensure that we respect international law.

I looked at the gentleman's bill. I would be glad to talk about other ways, including maybe some of the things that are in his bill. But I will tell the gentleman, the first couple that I looked at, the Keystone pipeline is not going to be reopened. The gentleman and I may lament that as a policy because I was publicly, during the

Obama administration, for the approval of that pipeline. So, I am prepared to work with the gentleman to see what we can do.

But we have done today's bill. It may not be perfect. It may not work. But it is certainly worth a try, to try to bring these awful prices down at the pump because I know all of our constituents, whether they live in Louisiana or Maryland, are struggling because they have to use their cars. They have to use that gasoline. They don't have an alternative. And they don't have an alternative to buying food.

Both of those are tough, and we need to act together to try to see if we can solve that problem in the context of an extraordinary pandemic, a historic pandemic that shut down the world, and we are just trying to get back.

We are trying to get supply chains going, including gasoline pipelines, which is why the President is going to Saudi Arabia, not to beg, but to assert the economic fact of the ramifications of the cartels stifling supply.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if there is common ground we can find on the components of H.R. 6858, I would be happy to help facilitate that negotiation because there are a number of very specific items in that bill that address the shortfalls, the deficiencies, the inability to produce energy in America. The Keystone pipeline might be one of the more well known.

President Biden, on his first day in office, canceled the Keystone pipeline.

Of course, it is not moving forward because he canceled it. It would provide a vital supply of oil from our friends in Canada that we wouldn't need from other people.

But there are a number of other pipeline issues. No new pipelines have been approved in the country. You have to have an ability to move energy around the country if we are going to be able to produce our own.

If a conscious decision was made in the White House that they don't want any pipelines, because that impedes the ability to produce energy in America, it just means we have to import more of it from other countries. Whether it is Saudi Arabia, Russia, any of them that I would not want us to have to get it from, it is going to come in some form. It might be a tanker. It is going to get here, and it is going to have to be put on rail or an 18-wheeler if it can't be put in a pipeline.

Let's get more pipelines produced, LNG export facilities. There are multiple, at least four, LNG export facilities that are sitting on the desk over at the Department of Energy ready to go. These are multibillion-dollar, privately funded projects that can't move forward because they won't move, yes or no, on those requests that have been pending for over a year.

Obviously, you look at leases, not being able to develop your lease. If you are a farmer and you own land, you could talk about all the thousands of acres of land, but if you need a permit

from the Federal Government to plant food and the Federal Government won't give you a permit to plant the food, then you can't use the land. The land is worthless.

You own leases on Federal or State lands, but the Federal Government, through President Biden, said you can't get permits to go and exercise that lease. Then the lease is worthless.

There has been a lot of talk by the White House about who to blame. By the way, I have never heard of President Biden pointing the finger at himself or looking in the mirror and going, is there something I can do? We have a list for him that he can do, and he won't.

But Joe Biden, as a candidate for President, has said things like this multiple times since being President: "No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period." That was Joe Biden.

Then, Joe Biden continued to carry out policies that followed through on those promises to kill drilling in America, and each step of the way, the price kept going up.

Prior to Putin's invasion—I know the President loves trying to blame Putin. Well in advance of Putin's invasion, the price of oil was going up. In fact, the President was—whatever terminology you want to use—pleading with, begging, asking Putin to produce more oil prior to the invasion of Ukraine. That was who Joe Biden was asking back then as he was carrying out his promise, "No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period."

He only applied that, by the way, to America. He was asking other countries to drill. He was just saying you can't do it here. Putin said no, by the way.

In the meantime, Putin was making \$700 million a day selling his oil to America and Europe during that period when President Biden was carrying out all the steps to stop drilling in America.

Then you fast forward. The price keeps going up. President Biden, again, doesn't look in the mirror.

The gentleman mentioned they blamed the pandemic. That didn't fly because that wasn't the case because people started getting out again, started going again.

Energy companies asked to start producing again and filed permit after permit application and got denied and denied and denied, so then the President blamed the oil and gas companies. They had hearings up here, brought in all the oil and gas companies.

Do you know what the oil and gas companies said under oath? They want to drill more, and they can't drill because of President Biden's policies. It is President Biden's policies stopping them from drilling.

Again, if the oil and gas companies or Putin were the reason that there was this inability, and President Biden, as he has done multiple times, blamed

them, if they were the reason that they had this shortfall, he would continue to be blaming them. But he knew the public wasn't buying it because it wasn't them, so he just blames more people.

Then, he goes to price gouging. As the gentleman pointed out, there was a bill here on the House floor a few weeks ago to try to shift the blame over to price gouging, and the answer was to allow you to sue your local gas station if you didn't like the price of gas.

Well, none of us like the price of gas. Suing your gas station is only going to make the price higher. Obviously, that had no impact because that wasn't the reason. But that was the answer and the attempt to try to blame somebody else.

Then we moved forward, and it is all of these other issues—refineries. This week, the White House started blaming refineries.

While the White House keeps throwing spaghetti at the wall, trying to figure out if somebody else will take the blame, he is going to go to Saudi and ask them to help us lower the price. Saudi's ability to produce is irrelevant to the price if we produce in America because we have the ability to drive down that price because we are not an OPEC nation. We are not a monopoly. We are a free-market economy when the free market is allowed to operate.

But President Biden, through his promises—"No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period"—in essence, he took the free market ability for America to produce energy off the table, which means he gave that leverage to monopolies, to cartels. They are taking advantage of it because President Biden gave them that.

Instead of asking them to produce more when they are fine with the high price of oil, whether it is Brent, West Texas, it doesn't matter what it is. He has taken it off in America so that they can limit the supply.

Let's not limit the supply. Again, if it is about saving the planet, if it is about carbon emissions, why not produce more here? There is no country in the world that produces oil that does it cleaner or better than us.

If you take America off the table, as President Biden has done—"No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore." That was Joe Biden. He took it off the table here. That means you are going to need oil from countries that emit more carbon to produce the same oil, so you get higher carbon emissions.

Again, that doesn't even count the carbon emissions that will occur when President Biden gets on Air Force One and flies over 5,700 miles to go have this conversation that he doesn't need to have because he can have that conversation right here in America at a place like Port Fourchon, where the answer would be yes, and it would be cleaner. And by the way, it would bring billions more dollars into America's Treasury. It would lower the price of

gasoline. It would create more jobs in America.

Every answer says yes, except President Biden keeps saying no. We want to address it through this legislation, which would counter some of those many things that President Biden has done to turn off the spigots in America.

If we can work on ways to confront this, I would be more than happy to have that negotiation, and we could go through, offline, how to do that. That is why I continue to bring up this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for all of that information.

It continues to befuddle me why our Republican friends would much prefer to blame President Biden and so avoid placing blame on Mr. Trump's friend, Mr. Putin. I don't understand that, Madam Speaker. It is not a nation indivisible.

Now, Madam Speaker, I used a statistic some weeks ago that I have heard not at all disputed. The Biden administration has approved more drilling permits on public land in 2021, in 1 year, than the Trump administration did each year during its first 3 years in office.

□ 1245

Not compared to the combined 3 years, just compared to each individual year. Number one.

Number two: Domestic oil production is greater today than it was under Trump. Not a whole big difference, 10,968 versus 11,185, but nevertheless, it speaks to the fact that the representation that somehow Biden has shut down the industry, and therefore, he is to blame.

We don't want to talk about the pandemic that shut down oil production. In Trump's last year—in Trump's last year—refineries in the U.S. reduced their capacity by more than 800,000 barrels. So, under the Trump administration, production was decreased.

Maybe they will look at the records and see whether or not that representation is accurate, and if it is not, I stand to be corrected. But those are the figures I have.

I notice that my friend did not respond to my representation that prices were higher under George Bush in 2008 than they are today. Now, because of inflation, the number is different, and compared to the world price, prices are higher.

So, I will say to my friend, we had at least 80 million acres, 2.5 million taken. As the gentleman pointed out before, the court said, No, that wasn't legal, so it was never effected. But we have those 800,000 that are not back online.

Don't blame them, though. Don't blame Putin. Don't blame the pandemic. Politically, let's blame Biden.

Now, I'm not sure why Bush had the higher price. Maybe it was that he was shutting down the oil business, the President from Texas. Maybe.

But there is more today being produced. Not by enough. Still, there are 800,000 barrels shut down. That is per day, by the way; not just 800,000—per day.

So we can argue back and forth on this. We are passing legislation. Our Republican friends, for the most part, voted against it. It won't work. It won't do.

I don't know whether they are right or wrong, but it is worth trying. It is worth trying because our consumers are hurting.

People at the grocery store—I go to the grocery store every weekend, Madam Speaker. I live alone. I don't buy a lot of groceries because they will go bad, so I go every weekend.

I see the shelves that are empty. I see the price of bacon has gone up now over \$10. I see the price of the eggs I get, the price of the half and half I buy, or the orange juice I buy. It is going up.

I am in the fortunate position where I can pay for it without it binding me someplace else. But I know that a whole lot of people that I see shopping, they have got that list out, and they are very worried about their costs.

I don't know whether this bill we just passed is going to solve that—certainly, not overnight. I don't know whether a month from now it will help somewhat, 5 cents or 10 cents on a pound of bacon or a dozen eggs.

I don't know that, but it was worth a try, and we passed this bill. We got some Republican support, including, I think, the ranking member of the committee that reported the bill out.

We are not technically at war, but we are spending a lot of money on behalf of freedom, and we ought to be together. We ought not to be carping about our President who is doing everything he can think of to try to get a handle on this, both on inflation, on the cost to consumers, and on the supply of a product that we all need.

So, I would simply make a request that let's work together to try to get this problem solved. Saudi Arabia is not the answer, but it is part of the answer. The cartel is part of the answer. The Russians are part of the answer.

Maybe none of them are the entire answer. But when you understand that this administration has given more leases on public land than the prior administration did in its first 3 years, it is hard to say that this administration is the reason for this. Other than politically, it is a very salient argument, but that is all it is.

Mr. SCALISE. Just for clarification, the ranking member voted "no" on the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Oh, okay. Sorry.

Mr. SCALISE. The 800,000 leases—and I know we talked about this before. You can have 800,000 leases, but when you need, then, permits to actually utilize the lease—so you have a lease to go and develop oil, but you need to drill. You need to do seismic. You need to build pipelines, infrastructure to move

it. If you don't get those permits to actually utilize the leases, the leases are worthless. That is what H.R. 6858 addresses. We have been raising that issue for a long time. The lease is no good if you can't, then, use the lease.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. What I said was, in Trump's last year, refineries in the U.S. reduced their capacity by more than 800,000 barrels. That didn't have anything to do about leases.

That had to do with an economic decision, which probably made sense because what happened is the economy was contracting.

Madam Speaker, 2.8 million net jobs were lost during the 4 years of Trump, and 8.7 million have been gained.

As they have been gaining, people are getting back in their cars. They are getting back and driving. They are spending on the economy. But what happened?

The pandemic had shut down supply lines. And the oil companies, rationally, when demand went down, they reduced capacity. They don't need a new lease to go back up to the 800,000. They were doing it under the present authorization that they have.

That was my point. It continues to be my point. The companies have made a decision and they are not moving ahead rapidly to try to get more production.

One of the reasons is—I get it—they are making a lot of money. Some oil companies have got 300 percent greater profits now than they had some years ago. 300 percent.

So, why do we need to do more product? We are making great money. Chevron says it had the most successful year in 2021 than it has ever had. It may be another oil company. I may be wrong on that.

Was it Chevron? I am asking somebody who probably knows the answer better than me. One of the oil companies reported that.

I am not criticizing them for that. What I am saying is, this is a multifaceted challenge that confronts us, and we ought to address it in a way that it deserves, and that is in a bipartisan way that will have effect.

I am going to work with the gentleman. As I said, I was for Keystone. I was not for shutting Keystone down. I was approving it to go ahead. I thought it made sense. Our friends in Canada have an extraordinary supply.

As the gentleman observes, though—interestingly, because I think many of your colleagues oppose those rules and regulations—it is cleaner. It is better for the environment to produce it here.

Why? Because we adopted regulations—either the administration adopted or we passed them in legislation, and very frankly, I think that many of those were opposed by—I don't know whether you, but many in your party, so it is better to do it here.

So I don't want to dispute that, but it is also necessary to have production, particularly among the cartel countries, and Russia has no interest—Russia has an interest in additional production.

Why? Because that is how they are funding this war. But we ought to spend time on criticizing Putin and his war and the crimes that are being committed in his name in Ukraine, and our determination to make sure the Ukrainian people who have displayed extraordinary courage, and Zelenskyy, who has displayed extraordinary leadership, make sure they know that we are focused on them. And we are focused against Putin, not our own President, any more than I did when, you know, George Bush was President.

Very frankly, I supported, as the gentleman probably knows, the trade bills. I thought it was good to do business. A lot of our people didn't support him on that. I supported him on that.

So I think we need to be not so critical of our President. We have one President at a time. We had a pandemic. It wasn't on his watch we got a pandemic. It was on his watch that we got a handle on the pandemic.

On his watch, he has been giving more access to public lands than his predecessor did. We can debate the nuances of differences, but we ought to focus on why we have this crisis.

The gentleman knows these prices in many ways reflect the confidence and the stability, or the lack of confidence and the lack of stability in the market, and the war directly relates to that issue.

Mr. SCALISE. Obviously, we will continue to debate this. Hopefully, we will debate it over H.R. 6858 where we can actually be talking about how we work together to solve the problem.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, Congress did come together, Republicans and Democrats, to give our friends in Ukraine the tools to go and push Putin out of much of Ukraine and, hopefully, all of Ukraine.

We will continue to stand with the incredibly strong, resilient people of Ukraine in standing up to Vladimir Putin.

We will, hopefully, have this debate further as we are talking about the legislation that we would like to bring.

Unless the gentleman has anything else—Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Juneteenth, which on Sunday, will be celebrated for a second year as a Federal holiday.

Now, on June 19, 1865, news of the end of slavery finally reached Galveston, Texas, more than 2 years after the

signing of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Now, my great-grandmother and many of my ancestors were born during slavery in Galveston, Texas. My grandfather was born in 1867 in Galveston, Texas. So this day has always symbolized a time for me personally, as well as for many African Americans; a time for reflection, as well as a recommitment to justice.

Each year, Juneteenth compels us to confront the darkest moments in our Nation's history, a chapter that was born in the Middle Passage, continued through slavery, and manifests itself today through systemic racism.

We must acknowledge the legacy of slavery and systemic racism that continues today in education and healthcare and a broken criminal justice system. I could go on and on.

It is also at the heart of the crises facing our Nation today, including economic injustice and hate-fueled violence.

As we recognize this important day in history, it is also crucial that we pass Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE's H.R. 40 legislation to develop a commission on reparations and recommit to an agenda for Black America that realizes true equity and justice.

APOLOGIES TO BORDER PATROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the recent developments regarding those brave Border Patrol officers who used their reins to prevent people sneaking into a country illegally, prevent them from getting stomped under their horses' hooves.

I have been to the border several times. Uniformly, all the Border Patrol felt those people behaved appropriately, and I think continuous studies have shown they behaved appropriately. But sadly, President Biden has decided to pick them out for punishment.

It reminds me when he calls the police of this country racist—both completely unfounded. He only does it, I think, to divide our country, create divisions here.

I would demand that President Biden apologize to the brave Border Patrol, those great guys or gals who, on that day, prevented the Haitians trying to slip into this country from getting stomped underfoot.

I would also like him to apologize to the police of this country who are not racist and are doing a great job to try to hold down our murder rate.

□ 1300

RIISING PRICES HIT LOW-INCOME FAMILIES HARDEST

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, rising prices at the pump and at the supermarket are costing families more each month, and higher prices are falling hardest on low-income families, who spend a larger share of their budget on food and gas.

Since the beginning of the year, gas prices have increased by nearly \$2. No doubt, this is in part due to Putin's war in Ukraine, but it is also driven by oil and gas companies raising prices on consumers.

Last month, the House passed the Gas Price Gouging Prevention Act to institute the first Federal law against profiteering by oil and gas companies. Today, the House considered and passed legislation to make cheaper and cleaner ethanol blends more available.

These commonsense measures would get gas prices under control and put money back in families' pockets.

HONORING FRANK BUCKLES

(Mr. MOONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to share the story of an American patriot from Charles Town, West Virginia, which is where I live.

Corporal Frank Buckles lived to be 110 years old. He died in 2011 and was America's last known World War I veteran. Buckles had enlisted in the Army by giving his age as 18 rather than his actual age of 16. He drove an Army ambulance in France in 1918 and came to symbolize a generation of embattled young Americans as the last of the World War I doughboys.

Buckles later spent 3 years as a Japanese prisoner of war during World War II after being captured in the Pacific while serving as a U.S. contractor.

Buckles lived on a 330-acre West Virginia cattle farm, where he drove a tractor until 102 years old. I am honored to introduce legislation to designate the United States Postal Service located in Charles Town, West Virginia, as the "Corporal Frank Buckles Post Office." He was a true patriot and is most deserving of this honor in the town he called home for 50 years.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MIKE SMITH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mike Smith, who was truly a pillar in the Fort Worth community. At 78 years old, Mike was a loving husband, father, grandfather, and was known as the unofficial mayor of Magnolia Avenue in Fort Worth.

Throughout his 55-year tenure, Mike baked over half a million pies, which put his restaurant, the Paris Coffee

Shop, on the map. His pies were listed in USA Today, Bon Appetit magazine, and really known all around the world, but what really made Mike so special was the warmth and love that he showed everyone that walked into his coffee shop.

It didn't matter if you were from Rivercrest or Riverside. It didn't matter if you were from Whitehall Street in Eastwood in Fort Worth or if you were from Westover Hills, Mike made everyone feel welcome any time you came into the Paris Coffee Shop. His firm handshake, his hugs, his conversations were just absolutely unforgettable, and he will be deeply missed.

Just in addition to everything that he has done for the food community, the restaurant community in Fort Worth, we send prayers out to his entire network of friends and family.

CONGRATULATING RUSSELL COUNTY BASEBALL

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Russell County High School baseball team, the Kentucky State High School runners-up. Their head coach, David Rexroat, has led the Lakers baseball team since 2002. He is the all-time winningest baseball coach at Russell County, and he was recently inducted into the Kentucky High School Baseball Coaches Hall of Fame.

Russell County began their journey to the State tournament by winning the 16th District baseball tournament, which includes my home school of Monroe County. They have won the 16th District 9 of the last 10 years. They won the region, the 4th Region in Bowling Green, and went on to Louisville to the State. They made it all the way to the State finals, to the State championship game.

The Russell County Lakers baseball team had nine seniors on that team that had played together most of their lives. They finished the season 31-7, the most wins in Russell County school history.

Madam Speaker, that State championship game was in Louisville, Kentucky, against St. Xavier, which is one of the largest high schools in the State. It is about a 2½ hour drive from Russell County to Louisville. Ninety-five percent of the crowd was from the small county of Russell County. This community is proud of this baseball team and their great accomplishment. I commend them for a tremendous baseball season.

HAPPY JUNETEENTH, AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this morning I introduced the 2022 Observance of Juneteenth Independence

Day Resolution. I thank my cosponsors and those who recognize this important Federal holiday.

H. Res. 1182 is to celebrate Juneteenth, but I was pleased to be the first Member of Congress, after years of introducing resolutions, to introduce the actual language of the Federal holiday signed by President Biden on June 17, 2021.

What is Juneteenth? It is a recognition of one of America's original sins, the slaves that were held over 200 years, and the brutality that they experienced but the freedom they experienced on June 19, 1865.

We can come together as a Nation to celebrate freedom in many, many ways. I am delighted that over the weekend in Houston and Galveston, we will be lifting up our voices of celebration, but we know that there are next steps.

As I have been introducing the resolution on Juneteenth, I also commend my colleagues to move forward on H.R. 40, the Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act. Again, what are reparations? It is healing, it is restoration, it is repair. We look forward to responding to the indicia in African-American communities that should be fixed. Happy Juneteenth, America. Let's celebrate together.

AMERICA'S ASTRONOMICAL NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, our current national debt is not only huge, it is astronomical. As of today, the national debt exceeds over \$30 trillion. To put that in perspective, that amount in \$100 bills laid side by side would circle the Earth over 1,167 times. If stacked, it would reach the International Space Station 80 times.

The debt crisis is truly out of this world, and yet my colleagues across the aisle would rather spend even more money on unnecessary programs with unrealistic goals. Effects of the debt are already being felt in the form of record-high inflation and gas prices, but perhaps the greatest tragedy is that it will be our children and our children's children who will ultimately foot the bill.

RACIAL JUSTICE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise today with an expression of gratitude and great appreciation.

I thank the many persons who voted for H.R. 2543, the Financial Services

Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act. I rise to thank persons for this because I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to manage the bill on the floor.

The Honorable MAXINE WATERS is the sponsor of this piece of legislation. It is a compilation of some 13 bills that were used and packaged so that we could bring about some racial justice in this country. Racial justice that is long overdue, I might add.

The Honorable MAXINE WATERS, but for her, I can say without reservation, hesitation, or equivocation, this bill would not have come to fruition. She has been a champion for those who have been left out, left behind, locked out, those that I label as being among the least, the last, and the lost.

The least, those who don't inherit a legacy of wealth but, rather, a legacy of poverty. The least, those are persons who are still finding themselves living in the streets of life.

The last, those are the last hired and the first fired.

The lost, those who are lost in the richest country in the world, but lost perhaps in chemical consumption, drugs, if you will, lost because of mental issues, but they are lost in the richest country in the world. She has been a champion for them.

I will always be grateful to her for working with me to help me to acquire a position on the Financial Services Committee. I think that probably but for her, I might not have the position that I have. So I know that she is not doing well today, but she will be back, and I want her to know today that I am appreciative for the many opportunities that I have acquired by virtue of her being there at the right time when these opportunities were available.

I also thank the Members who had those bills, the 13 bills: Mrs. JOYCE BEATTY, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TORRES, and of course, Ms. WATERS, had a bill as well. I had two bills associated with this package.

This package, the Financial Services Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act, why is it needed? Why is it needed on this day some few days away from Juneteenth? And I celebrate Juneteenth, by the way. I commend my colleague, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for her work on Juneteenth.

I knew the father of Juneteenth, Al Edwards. Al Edwards was a State representative in Texas, and he was a person who was tenacious about Juneteenth. It was his legislation that passed the Texas House and Senate and was signed by the Governor of the State of Texas, making Juneteenth a holiday at a time when, quite frankly, people thought that it was impossible to get it done.

Al Edwards, the father of Juneteenth, I always remember him, a dear friend. We celebrated Juneteenth together on many occasions. We traversed the State together. He was one of my supporters. I know his family.

His brother was a banker, Redick Edwards. He was my banker, as a matter of fact. So I have a relationship with this family. I want the world to know that I am appreciative for what he did to lay the foundation for Juneteenth as a holiday at the national level.

I also express my appreciation for what Juneteenth is all about. General Gordon Granger came into Galveston, Texas, in 1865. The Emancipation Proclamation had been signed. The war had ended, but in Texas, the slaves were not accorded their freedom. Some people say that the word hadn't reached Texas. I differ. The word reached Texas, but the slaveholders saw those slaves as personal property, and they saw no reason to give up their personal property simply because Mr. Lincoln signed an Emancipation Proclamation or simply because the war was over. That was their personal property.

It is said that someone was sent, an envoy, if you will, to make it known to people in Texas that the slaves had been freed. This is prior to General Gordon Granger arriving in Galveston, Texas in 1865. Well, they said that that person didn't quite get the message across, and one can well understand why, given the behavior of Texas, a State that seceded from the Union and also seceded from Mexico because of slavery.

□ 1315

They were recalcitrant—and that is being kind—about the desire to maintain slavery. But President Lincoln sent General Gordon Granger.

To say that he sent General Gordon Granger, quite frankly, is an incomplete statement. He sent General Gordon Granger and 2,000 troops. General Gordon Granger, being the wise man that he was, brought those troops with him, but they also had some friends with them. They had Mr. Winchester, Smith & Wesson. They were well equipped to present this message to the slaveholders. When it was presented with 2,000 troops who were well armed, it was received.

It was the next year that the first Juneteenth celebration took place. That was in 1866, the first celebration.

This is what Al Edwards shared with me about Juneteenth, the actual moniker, the name for the holiday. It was his position that it became known as "Juneteenth" because there was some question about the date that General Gordon Granger arrived, within the minds of the slaves, whether it was on the 18th or the 19th. Rather than continue a debate about the actual date, it simply became "Juneteenth," and folks can fill in the blank as they choose. 1866 was a big celebration of Juneteenth, a celebration of freedom.

Again, I commend the father, Al Edwards, and I commend my colleague, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for her stellar work here in Congress to work Juneteenth through to the point that it is now a Federal holiday. I commend both of

them. I commend the many people who voted for it.

Today, I thank the people who voted for that holiday, but I also thank the people who voted for H.R. 2543. I greatly appreciate the fact that you voted for the Financial Services Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act because that act is needed.

There has to be some question as to why it is needed more than 150 years after the end of slavery. Why would we need a Financial Services Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act these many years later?

Well, rather than give you my opinion about it, I am going to read to you from a report presented by the Brookings Institution. Brookings is well known and well respected. Let's just see what Brookings says. This was published on February 27, 2020. Not a lot has changed since February 27, 2020, so let's examine what they at the Brookings Institution have shared with us with reference to the Black folk in this country.

It is styled, the article, "Examining the Black-White Wealth Gap." Hear now the words of the Brookings Institution: "A close examination of wealth in the U.S. finds evidence of staggering racial disparities. At \$171,000, the net worth of a typical White family is nearly 10 times greater than that of a Black family, which is \$17,150." This was in 2016.

2016, White family's worth: \$171,000. This is the net worth. Black family's net worth: \$17,150. Over 150 years since the end of the Civil War, more than 400 years since the first Africans were brought here as slaves in 1619, 400 years have passed, and we still have this wage gap.

It goes on to read: "Gaps in wealth between Black and White households reveal the effects of accumulated inequality and discrimination, as well as differences in power and opportunity that can be traced back to this Nation's inception."

"Traced back to this Nation's inception." This is the Brookings Institution. "Traced back to this Nation's inception."

"The Black-White wealth gap reflects a society that has not and does not afford equality of opportunity to all its citizens."

Equality of opportunity is the opportunity—these are my words—to succeed on your merits or fail on your demerits, the opportunity for you to pull yourself up by your bootstraps. The society, according to Brookings, does not afford equality of opportunity to all its citizens.

It goes on to indicate: "Efforts by Black Americans to build wealth can be traced back throughout American history. But these efforts have been impeded in a host of ways, beginning with 246 years of chattel slavery followed by congressional mismanagement of the Freedman's Savings Bank."

This bank was established after the slaves were freed to provide them an

opportunity to accumulate wealth. They were free, but they were just free to the elements. They didn't have property that they owned. They were free to have persons abuse them. They were in a hostile environment. They were among people who had held them as property, people who had no desire to see their property taken from them.

So they were free, but they were free to the wind, the rains, the elements, free to starve, and free to survive if they could. But that level of freedom was supposed to be curtailed with the Freedman's Savings Bank.

Well, the bank started with the best of intentions. According to the history I have read, it was the idea of Frederick Douglass and was supposed to give the freed slaves an opportunity to acquire wealth, to save money, to understand the process of saving money, by the way. For people who had never had money—imagine this—never had money, what do you do with it if you acquire some? Many of them were working for the Union Army, and they were getting paid. So what do you do with this thing called money?

Well, this bank was a place where they were supposed to be able to save. Unfortunately, there was mismanagement. Congress did not put in the proper safeguards so that it could continue to exist in perpetuity, and it left some 61,144 depositors with losses of nearly \$3 million in 1874.

Then, there were persons who sought to move ahead, notwithstanding circumstances, and there was this area in Tulsa, Oklahoma, Tulsa's Greenwood District.

Here is what is said by Brookings with reference to Greenwood. It reads: "The violent massacre decimating Tulsa's Greenwood District in 1921, a population of 10,000 that thrived as the epicenter of African-American business and culture, commonly referred to as 'Black Wall Street,'—Black Wall Street was decimated. This was an opportunity for people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, to find a means by which they could have commerce among themselves. They were of no threat to the broader community, but they had Black Wall Street taken away from them, literally destroyed."

Thereafter, we had the discriminatory policies throughout the 20th century, including Jim Crow-era Black codes, laws that applied specifically to Black people. If you weren't working, you could be incarcerated if you were Black.

This is not contained here, but you had the convict leasing that took place, which was another form of slavery. A person would be arrested for some minor offense and then placed in the hands of a landowner to work—leased, as it were, from the State. Some of these persons would work for the rest of their lives for some minor offense. They became slaves by another name, leased convicts.

So, we had Black codes limiting opportunities in many Southern States.

Along came the GI Bill. We are fast-forwarding now, and this is part of the article that I am reading. The GI Bill benefited and still benefits—a good many people who are right here in this Congress benefited from the GI Bill. Few Black people did. Very few Black people benefited from the GI Bill. The statistical information is overwhelming in terms of the number that did not, small numbers.

Of the thousands that initially benefited from it, numbers less than 10 were Black. Thousands, with 10 maybe, or less, that were Black. There are some people who give a specific number on it at less than 10. But let's just leave it with the fact that there were less than 10 who benefited from it among thousands.

Here is why they didn't benefit. They didn't benefit because if you wanted to get a mortgage to buy property, which is what the GI Bill would afford you, the banks wouldn't lend money in Black neighborhoods. If you were Black and you walked into the bank, that in and of itself was a denial of the loan. Your presence, your skin complexion, that was the denial of your loan because banks were not lending to people living in Black neighborhoods.

Well, someone would say: But, Al, how did they know they were living in a Black neighborhood? Because you couldn't live in a White neighborhood. You couldn't live among people who could get loans. There were restrictive covenants. The law said they couldn't live there, and they were denied the opportunity to acquire land, which was another means of amassing wealth.

By the way, this was not the first time people of color were denied the opportunity to acquire land. In the early years in this country, if you could fence in land and you could protect it, you could squat. It became yours. All you had to do was fence it in and protect it. Black people were not afforded that opportunity.

So, here we are, a few days away from Juneteenth, which I will celebrate and appreciate, but I want you to understand why there was a need for H.R. 2543, the Financial Services Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act. There was a need for it. There is a need for it, and it passed this Congress.

□ 1330

So we find ourselves now with the GI Bill and other circumstances that did not inure to the benefit of Black people.

According to this article, another circumstance was redlining. Redlining is where literally a red line was drawn around certain areas, and those who were in the business of selling and buying real estate, they rarely wanted to buy that land, so it became a place where people of color lived and the people of color could not get loans to upgrade their property, they could not get the loans needed to improve their lives because the banks were not lending.

So this wealth that many people have, the wealth that they have is something that they acquired in ways that were associated with the government that locked Black people out. This—according to the article now—history matters for contemporary inequality, in part, because its legacy is passed down generation to generation. Repeat. This history matters for contemporary inequality, meaning the inequality we see today, in part, because its legacy is passed down generation to generation through unequal monetary inheritances which make up a great deal of current wealth, meaning a good many of the people who have the current wealth they acquired this wealth by being born.

A good many people make their first million dollars by being born, just coming into the world, coming into the world in the right family. And these inheritances are passed down from generation to generation through unequal monetary inheritances, which make up a good deal of the current wealth.

Interesting fact: In 2020 Americans are projected to inherit about \$765 billion in gifts. In 2020, Americans are projected to inherit about \$765 billion in gifts and bequests. I assure you only a marginal amount of this will be inherited by Black people.

Excluding wealth transfers to spouses and transfers that support minor children, inheritances account for roughly 4 percent of annual household income. Black people have little to pass on, therefore, there is very little that is inherited. And as a result there is no transfer of wealth from one generation to the next to speak of.

It is really a sad state of affairs when you really think about it. We have been so conditioned to accept our circumstances in life that this sad state of affairs is just normal to us. It is just as we have embraced it almost. It is just the way things are. Things don't have to be this way. That is why H.R. 2543 is needed.

Let me remind you one more time that Black people in this country have wealth that is about one-tenth of what White people have, about one-tenth of what they have. That, my friends, is something that is unacceptable. And it is not because Black people won't work hard. It is not because they don't have good work ethics. No, it is because a system that we exist within has been so structured that not only did we fail to acquire wealth, couldn't acquire it early on in the history of the country, but this system still prevents Black people from acquiring wealth.

I come to the floor and talk about these issues quite regularly, and there are some people who have asked me why am I so passionate about these issues?

Well, why do I persist when I could easily just go on with my life?

And I have had people tell me: You are doing all right. You are doing well. You have all of the trappings of a middle-class person. Why would you do this?

Because I haven't always been where I am now, and because I have a memory.

I know what it is like to live in poverty.

I know what it is like to be discriminated against. I am a son of the segregated south. Those rights that the Constitution recognized as belonging to me, my friends and neighbors took them away. They denied them.

I know what it is like to drink from a colored water fountain.

I know what it is like to go to a back door to get your food. And I know what it is like for the law to say that you have to go to that back door to get your food.

I know what it is like to stand in a separate line in the supermarket and have to wait until all of the persons who are White are served before you can be served.

I know what it is like to be born in a racist society. Believe me. I was born into the south. I am 74 years old. I know what racism smells like. I know what it looks like, I know what it tastes like, I know what it sounds like, and I know what it hurts like.

So my passion emanates from the suffering and the understanding of what it is like to live in a hostile environment.

My friends, Black people are still living in a hostile environment. We don't like to acknowledge it, we want to believe otherwise, but it is a hostile environment. It is a hostile environment.

When you go in to get a loan and you are qualified, and you cannot get the same loan that a person of a different hue can acquire who is equally as qualified as you, you are equally as qualified as that person, that is hostile to you in terms of your economic status. H.R. 2543 seeks to remedy that. H.R. 2543 makes it a crime to discriminate against a person in lending.

I must tell you, the Honorable MAXINE WATERS has more courage than we can measure. There is no way to measure the amount of courage this woman has to bring this kind of legislation to this floor. And I have to acknowledge that the other leadership in the House, it was pretty courageous of them, too, to let this kind of bill come to the floor for a vote. And I congratulate and thank every person that voted for it. Because it ought to be a crime to defraud a person out of a loan.

For edification purposes, if you defraud the bank, you can face a fine of up to \$1 million, up to a \$1 million fine. And you can be imprisoned. There is no such fine if the bank denies you a loan, defrauds you of your loan that you are entitled to.

That changed with the passage of H.R. 2543. This is historic. You are not going to read about it in the newspapers. But you are going to hear about it from me right here on this floor of the House.

I didn't come here to hide the good news. We want to let the world know about the good news. The challenge

would be, of course, to get it through the Senate. I believe this President will sign it but getting it through the Senate will be a challenge.

But back to where we were. So we find ourselves acclimating to the hostile environment we have. We find ourselves accepting our circumstance. And there are others who would say that you are free, you can just make your way as others have made their way, pull yourself up by your bootstraps.

Well, let's see where we are with bootstraps. Bootstraps would first require that you have boots. Black folk don't have the boots. The boots are at the banks.

People in this country who have little acquire some things with their hard work and then they are in a position to borrow money. If we are not given a fair opportunity to borrow money, which would give us the boots, and then we can have straps added to the boots, you are not going to be able to pull yourself up by the bootstraps when you don't have boots. It just doesn't happen. And that is the circumstance we find ourselves in.

There are many people who will say that by doing what I am doing I am just making excuses. Well, tell that to the people at the Brookings Institution. Convince them. They compile this statistical information, the empirical evidence I have shared with you. This is not AL GREEN speaking in the sense of AL GREEN compiled the information that you have heard. No. This is the Brookings Institution. I am just the messenger. They compiled the message.

So we find ourselves in this hostile environment as it relates to the economy.

It is a hostile environment in many other ways, as well. It is a hostile environment just in terms of our living. Still discriminated against when it comes to housing. Still discriminated against. And it took the death of Dr. King to get the Fair Housing Act through Congress.

It is amazing how many of the seminal pieces of legislation that impact the lives of people of color are signed in ink, but they were written with the blood of people who made great sacrifices, Dr. King's life, John Lewis and the Edmund Pettus Bridge. But for John Lewis and the Edmund Pettus Bridge, additional civil rights laws would not have been signed into law. It took blood on the bridge to bring about the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

□ 1345

So my dear friends, we are in a hostile environment. People don't like to talk about the hostile environment. When people say Jews will not replace us—when they say Jews will not replace us—my friends, many of those people work in restaurants.

One can but only imagine what happens to the food of a Jewish person when you have a person working in the restaurant who says Jews will not replace us. Given that this theory—this

fake theory, this myth—there are some other words that can be used that my mother taught me not to use, but these prevarications are associated with this myth.

Friends, the myth is that Jews are going to use Black people to replace White people—which is ridiculous. But that means that there are some people that are very hostile to Black people since they think Black people are going to take over—and minorities and immigrants.

Just imagine what it can be like to go into a restaurant, and you have persons who don't find favor with treating us fairly. We have to be careful where we eat—we do—if you understand the environment you are living in. Hostile environment.

Can you imagine some of these persons—Jews will not replace us—persons who are up in Idaho dressed in this military regalia, can you imagine one of them being a physician? You have got to go into this office, you need help, maybe you are going into the emergency room. It is a hostile environment.

You can't appreciate it if you don't understand the consequences that can emanate from people who scream Jews will not replace us, people who burn crosses, people who say that they are a part of a superior race.

You don't think it is a hostile environment? Ask the ghosts of the people who went into the Tops Food Store. Ask the ghosts if it is a hostile environment. He went there to kill Black people. If you don't think it is a hostile environment, ask the spirits of the people who were in the Walmart store in Texas. It is a hostile environment.

It is hostile if you understand and appreciate what is going on around you. I don't say it is hostile to the extent that we can't overcome it. I don't say it is hostile to the extent that we should simply surrender and throw up our hands. That is why we have H.R. 2543, and there are other aspects of it requiring transparency. We need to know who is integrating their business.

Sometimes when people have to announce their circumstance, they change that condition. H.R. 2543 will provide a lot of transparency. This is needed when you are in a hostile environment.

I would say to you, my dear friends—as Brookings puts it—just how large and persistent are these racial wealth gaps? Brookings has made it very clear that at least \$17,150 for a Black family in terms of wealth is about one-tenth of the \$171,000 net worth of a White family.

My hope is that we will remember yesterday as a moment in time that will hopefully accelerate the time that we will need to bring about a closing of this wealth gap. I think that what happened yesterday is a great step in that direction. It is not the last step. It is really not the first, there are other things that have been done, but it is a step in that direction. We need to close the wealth gap.

Madam Speaker, I pledge to do all that I can to close it. I want to let you know that in doing all of these things and saying what I am saying to you, explaining it in terms that many people will find uncomfortable, I still say that I love my country.

I still say I love my country. I still say I salute the flag. I am not some person who hates America. I am the guy who wants America to become America for all Americans. I want equality of opportunity. I want America to live up to its promise.

As I celebrate Juneteenth, I assure you, I will do the things that are customarily done in terms of the food and the drink and just having a great time celebrating freedom. It does not mean that I am going to forget the need for more work to be done.

I have great respect for and appreciation for Mr. HOYER. I can't tell you how much I appreciate and respect him. He has said things here on this floor that I appreciate with reference to discrimination. Others have said things, too, that I greatly appreciate, it is just that I have sort of built a relationship with him.

I appreciate his indicating that Slavery Remembrance Day is something that is on his agenda. I am going to celebrate Juneteenth, but that doesn't mean that I won't commemorate August and Slavery Remembrance Day, that is a day of commemoration.

Madam Speaker, I am going to enjoy Juneteenth, but remembering that there is still great work to be done. I remember as a child my grandfather reminding me that I would have to be willing to make sacrifices that others would not have to make if I wanted to succeed in life in this country. Sacrifices that others would not have to make. I assumed that we all make the same sacrifices, but my grandfather taught my differently—that is not the case.

While I celebrate, I still have some appreciation for the sacrifices that have been made and have to be made. I understand that we need the MAXINE WATERS of the world who work hard to make sure that while she has the gavel that the change that she can bring about will take place.

I appreciate the SHEILA JACKSON LEES of the world who worked hard to make Juneteenth a holiday. It is a holiday and it is a time to celebrate. I also think we need a day to commemorate because in Texas there is a desire to not allow slavery to be taught—the history of African Americans as it relates to slavery to be taught in the schools. You can't teach it if Texas has its way.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate and commemorate. I thank God for the opportunity to serve in this House. I thank those persons who voted for the bill that we brought to the floor, H.R. 2543. I appreciate you, each of you, and I will be sending you a written thank you, but I didn't want too much time to pass without saying it to the world. I appreciate it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4160.—An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to grant the Supreme Court of the United States security-related authorities equivalent to the legislative and executive branches.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 1 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 17, 2022, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4359. A letter from the Administrator, National Organic Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Origin of Livestock [Doc. No.: AMS-NOP-11-0009; NOP-21-04] (RIN: 0581-AD89) received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4360. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Policy and Program Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection of Yak and other Bovidae, Cervidae, and Camelidae Species [Docket No.: FSIS-2019-0028] (RIN: 0583-AD73) received June 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4361. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, EBSA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's notice — Amendments to Class Prohibited Transaction Exemptions To Remove Credit Ratings Pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act [Application Number D-11681] (ZRIN: 1210-ZA18) received April 5, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-4362. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Antarctic Krill Meal [Docket No.: FDA-2018-C-1007] received May 18, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4363. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) Program: RFS Annual Rules [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-0324; FRL-8521-01-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV11) received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4364. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District; Correcting Amendment [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0573; FRL-9453-02-R9] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4365. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2021-0662; FRL-9465-02-R3] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4366. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District; Open Burning [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0799; FRL-9246-02-R9] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4367. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky Area to Attainment of the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0949; FRL-9532-02-R5] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4368. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky Area to Attainment of the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0949; FRL-9532-02-R5] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4369. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final authorization — ILLINOIS: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R05-RCRA-2021-0374; FRL-9898-01-R5] received June 6, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4370. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Montana; 2015 Ozone NAAQS Interstate Transport Requirements [EPA-R08-OAR-2021-0678; FRL-9299-02-R8] received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4371. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Wisconsin Portion of the Chicago-Naperville, Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0885; FRL-9523-02-R5] received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4372. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Envi-

ronmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Addition of 1-Bromopropane to the list of CERCLA Hazardous Substances; List of Hazardous Substances; Technical Corrections [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2022-0299; FRL-9335-01-OLEM] received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4373. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus subtilis* strain AFS032321; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0495; FRL-8920-01-OCSP] received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4374. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Ozone and Particulate Matter Controls Strategies [EPA-R02-OAR-2021-0572, FRL-9439-02-R2] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4375. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Montana; Thompson Falls PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2021-0809; FRL-9579-02-R8] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4376. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Montana; Whitefish PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2021-0808; FRL-9595-02-R8] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4377. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Teflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0434; FRL-9636-01-OCSP] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4378. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Source Specific Changes for Jefferson County [EPA-R04-OAR-2021-0188; FRL-9775-02-R4] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4379. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Picarbutrazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0400; FRL-9849-01-OCSP] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4380. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final determination — Determination to Defer Sanctions; Cali-

fornia; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0439; FRL-9870-03-R9] received June 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4381. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Associate Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's IRB only rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements received April 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3952. A bill to strengthen the role of the Chief Scientist of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in order to promote scientific integrity and advance the Administration's world-class research and development portfolio; with an amendment (Rept. 117-373, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7233. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under Medicaid State plans for health screenings and referrals for certain eligible juveniles in public institutions; and to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue clear and specific guidance under the Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance programs to improve the delivery of health care services, including mental health services, in elementary and secondary schools and school-based health centers; with amendments (Rept. 117-74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3952 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 8095. A bill to impose limitations on the amount of indirect costs allowable under Federal research awards to institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. SPEIER,

Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 8096. A bill to create a civil action to enforce the standards promulgated under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr.

HUFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 8097. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an initiative to conduct research, development, and demonstration on technologies capable of reducing both greenhouse gas emissions and noise emissions from aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 8098. A bill to limit eligibility for public service loan forgiveness to borrowers of Federal student loans with incomes below a certain maximum threshold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 8099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules applicable to using private activity bonds for broadband projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 8100. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire psychiatrists; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8101. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Social Security to conduct a study relating to administrative costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CLOUD):

H.R. 8102. A bill to prohibit the mass cancellation of student loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 8103. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include indoor agricultural technology as an activity that supports well-rounded education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 8104. A bill to assess the semiconductor requirements of the Department of Defense in a conflict scenario, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCANLON,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 8105. A bill to require small, medium, and large hub airports to certify that airport service workers are paid the prevailing wage and provided fringe benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 8106. A bill to provide for disclosures of certain foreign contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 8107. A bill to prohibit States from imposing a tax on the retail sale of men's products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 8108. A bill to protect Native cultural sites located on Federal land, to improve consultation with Indian Tribes, to bring parity to Indian Tribes with regard to Federal public land management laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 8109. A bill to establish the Tribal Cultural Areas System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. CHU, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BRADY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BANKS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. STEIL):

H.R. 8110. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Hmong people, in recognition of their highly distinguished service in the Vietnam war and the fight against communism; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACOBS of California (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CHU, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE,

Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. WILD, Mr. CROW, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROSS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. NEWMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H.R. 8111. A bill to protect the privacy of personal reproductive or sexual health information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 8112. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to treat all institutions of higher education equally for purposes of determining the Federal share under the Federal work-study programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 8113. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate certain charges under the TRICARE dental program for members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 8114. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to expand certain protections to dependents of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 8115. A bill to amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize sales and leases of certain Federal land to federally recognized Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 8116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 8117. A bill to exempt certain Federal hydrogen programs from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 8118. A bill to prohibit the purchase, ownership, or possession of enhanced body armor by civilians, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BABIN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 8119. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit the ability to take into account the mental health of an applicant for asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 8120. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain products of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8121. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from making certain grants to zero-emission or electric ferries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8122. A bill to amend title 23 and title 49, United States Code, to prohibit funds from certain programs to be used to fund streetcars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 8123. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for the Special Presidential Envoy for Climate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 8124. A bill to amend section 8302 of title 41, United States Code, to require Buy American Act requirements to apply to solar power purchase agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 8125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for starter 401(k)s for employers with no retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 8126. A bill to improve the procedures of the national instant criminal background check system in the case of firearm transfers by federally licensed firearms importers, manufacturers, and dealers before the completion of the related criminal background check, and to provide for annual reports on default firearm transfers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 8127. A bill to reauthorize the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the uses for funds under qualified tuition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8129. A bill to give the Federal Trade Commission authority over certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8130. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation of the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct an annual study on health care competition and consolidation at the State level; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8131. A bill to amend the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004 to repeal the antitrust exemption applicable to graduate medical resident matching programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8132. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Obamacare ban on provider-owned hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8133. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to address incorrect billing by off-campus hospital locations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8134. A bill to eliminate the inpatient-only service list; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8135. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to evaluate the effects of anticompetitive contracting clauses in contracts between health insurers and health care providers and to determine actions taken by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice relating to the use of such clauses in such contracts and to assess their ability to effectively enforce the Federal antitrust laws with respect to such use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 8136. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for protective regulations when a species is listed as an endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BANKS, Ms. FOXX, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 8137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 8138. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize and modify the Lake Champlain Basin Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JONES, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. MCEACHIN):

H. Res. 1182. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2022, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MAST, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H. Res. 1183. A resolution denouncing domestic terrorist violence against religious organizations and domestic terrorist violence against groups and organizations providing pregnancy support for expectant mothers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H. Res. 1184. A resolution urging the use of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to expand short-term refinery capacity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 1185. A resolution embracing the goals and provisions of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KUSTER):

H. Res. 1186. A resolution honoring the life of Petty Officer Raul Guerra of Montebello, California, who perished on October 8, 1967, during military operations off northern Vietnam, and the work of the Bring Raul Home Committee to have Petty Officer Raul Guerra's remains laid to rest in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-178. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan,

relative to Senate Resolution No. 130, urging the federal government to extend Title 42 to avoid a crisis at the border; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ML-179. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, urging and requesting the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take any action necessary to halt federal actions resulting in the delay or cancellation of offshore oil and natural gas lease sales and the United States Department of the Interior to expedite actions necessary to comply with a court order to resolve lease sales, finalize a new five-year plan for oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf, and focus efforts on lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ML-180. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to Joint Resolution H. 3205, requesting Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing amendments pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution limited to proposing amendments that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-181. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 652, supporting the secure wall on the southern border of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

ML-182. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 22R258, urging the federal government to pursue a broad range of measures to reduce the danger of nuclear war, to sign and ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), to make nuclear disarmament the centerpiece of our national security policy, and to spearhead a global effort to prevent nuclear war; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CORREA introduced A bill (H.R. 8139) for the relief of Ivana Alexandra Sifuentes Arbirio and Luisa Mariana Sifuentes Arbirio; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 8095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 8096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing—"All legislative

Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 8098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 8099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 grants that Congress shall "have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises;" Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that Congress shall "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that "The Congress shall have Power to . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 8100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. . .

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 8102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 8103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 8105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 8106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 8108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 8109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JACOBS of California:

H.R. 8111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 8112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 8113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

[Page H6243]

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 8114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

[Page H1148]

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 8115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 8116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 8117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 8118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

[page H10170]

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 8119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 8120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 8123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 11 Section 8: “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 8125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 8126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 8127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 8135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 8136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 8137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 8138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 8139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 124: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 198: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 475: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 622: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 705: Mr. FULCHER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. CAWTHORN.

H.R. 1282: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1348: Mr. SWALLOW.

H.R. 1560: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1611: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1627: Mr. GOMEZ and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1661: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1696: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1956: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 2021: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 2143: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. WILD, and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2373: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2483: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2517: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2972: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3031: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 3088: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3172: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 3183: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3342: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H.R. 3572: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3759: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3865: Ms. DELAULO and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H.R. 3962: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4134: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 4151: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 4436: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 4450: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 4479: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 4602: Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 4603: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4750: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 4944: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5441: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H.R. 5648: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5654: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 5769: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 6207: Mrs. HAYES and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 6283: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6526: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 6538: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MANNING, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BERA, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 6571: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MAST, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 6613: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 6785: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 6823: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 6913: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 6989: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 7030: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 7076: Mr. JACOBS of New York and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 7109: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 7158: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 7181: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 7294: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 7382: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WILD, and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 7398: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 7427: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 7477: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 7525: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 7534: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 7565: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 7668: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 7744: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 7750: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 7775: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 7779: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 7832: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 7851: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 7933: Ms. JACOBS of California and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 7961: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 7966: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 7971: Ms. TITUS and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 7987: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 8006: Mr. WENSTRUP and Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 8051: Ms. NEWMAN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 8058: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 8069: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 8071: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.J. Res. 87: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BASS, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CAWTHORN.

H. Res. 159: Mr. MEUSER.

H. Res. 191: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H. Res. 366: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 569: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH.

H. Res. 580: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 749: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 764: Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 910: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 1137: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. JACOBS of California.

H. Res. 1156: Ms. BASS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. TRONE.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1735: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 2374: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 5828: Mr. HILL.